Vol. LXVIII, No. 2 February, 1923

The Ecclesiastical Review

Monthly Publication for the Clergy Cum Approbatione Superiorum

CONTENTS

THE PETRINE CONFESSION 113
The Rev. CORNELIUS F. CREMIN, S.T.L., L.Ph., The St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Minnesota.
REUNION FALLACIES 125
The Rev. HENRY PATRICK RUSSELL, Rugby, England.
CHURCH RECONSTRUCTION UNDER BISHOP ENGLAND, 1822-1842 135
The Rev. PETER GUILDAY, Ph.D., Catholic University, Washington, D. C.
THE UNIAT ARMENIAN CHURCH 147
The Rev. MATERNUS SPITZ, O.S.B., Birmingham, England.
SOCIALISM AND THE CATHOLIC PULPIT 161
The Rev. HERBERT J. PARKER, S.J., Manila, Philippine Islands.
IMPORTANCE OF RURAL PARISHES 165
INQUIRENS.
WHY SHOULD PRIESTS BE POOR? 167
PULLER.
A PASTORAL CRUSADE THROUGH THE HOLY NAME SOCIETY 170
The Rev. JOSEPH C. FLEMING, New York City.
FOUR REASONS WHY CATHOLICS MAY NOT LAWFULLY JOIN A MASONIC LODGE 175
The Rev. MANUEL PEYPOCH, S.J.
THE PRINTING OF THE MISSAL 177
MARYKNOLL MISSION LETTERS. XXXVII: Impressions of Japan 178
The Rev. PHILIP S. TAGGART, A.F.M., Yeungkong, China.
RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEFRAUDING AN INSURANCE COMPANY 186
THE THREE CRUCIFIXES OF GOLGOTHA 189
INDEX OF FORBIDDEN BOOKS 191
CONCERNING DANCES 195
RECENT PHILOSOPHICAL LITERATURE 198
The Rev. CHARLES P. BRUEHL, Ph.D., St. Charles Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa.

CONTENTS CONTINUED INSIDE

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW
1305 Arch Street THE DOLPHIN PRESS Philadelphia, Pa.

Copyright, 1923: American Ecclesiastical Review—The Dolphin Press

Subscription Price: United States and Canada, $4.00
London, England: R. & T. Washbourne, 4 Paternoster Row Melbourne, Australia: W. P. Linehan, 309 Little Collins St.
Entered, 5 June, 1889, as Second Class Matter, Post Office at Philadelphia, Pa., under Act of 3 March, 1879

BROTHERHOOD CORPORATION

E. R. EMERSON and L. L. FARRELL, Sole Owners

(Succeeding the Brotherhood Wine Co., Established 1839)

Producers of the Finest Sacramental Wines in America

New York Office, 71 Barclay St.,
Vineyards, Washingtonville, N. Y., and California

Loyola (Moderately Sweet)
Loyola (Moderately Sweet, Res. Vint.)
Loyola (Dry)
Loyola (Dry, Reserve Vintage)
Veravena (Imported from Spain)
Liguorian Riesling
St. Benedict (Sweet)
Cardinal Red (Dry, Claret Type)

Kindly ask for Price List

Revenue tax will be added and kegs at cost

RECOMMENDATIONS FROM PRELATES AND PRIESTS ON REQUEST

We extend a cordial invitation to the Rev. Clergy to visit our vineyards and cellars

Altar Wines sold direct to the Reverend Clergy only

ALTAR WINES BEYOND DOUBT

SOLE EASTERN AGENTS OF THE FAMOUS

JESUIT ALTAR WINES

L'ADMIRABLE

NOVITIATE

VILLA JOSEPH

MALVOISIE

Novitiate of Los Gatos

Los Gatos, Cal.

December 17, 1921.

BARNSTON TEA COMPANY
Barclay Street
NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.

Gentlemen: It gives us pleasure to inform you that another carload containing 8947½ gallons of Novitiate wines, is now on its way to you. It was prepared, as usual, with every possible care and the car was sealed in the presence of our representative at the depot of the Southern Pacific Company, Los Gatos, California. This brings the total number of gallons shipped to you during 1921 to ***26437½***.

These wines are absolutely pure and were made by our own Brothers for the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. They have been under our own care and supervision and the clergy has every assurance that they are materia valida et licita and are highly recommended by the Most Reverend Archbishop of San Francisco. We commit them to your hands in the fullest confidence that you will distribute them to the priests for the high purpose for which they are made, in the same absolute purity in which you received them from us. Yours very respectfully,

SACRED HEART NOVITIATE
THOS. R. MARTIN, S.J., Rector.

Barnston Tea Company, 6 Barclay St., New York

PURE ALTAR WINES

BEAULIEU VINEYARD

Made from grapes produced in Beaulieu Vineyard and St. Joseph's Agricultural Institute, at Rutherford, Napa County, California. These wines are made under the supervision of Rev. D. O. Crowley, appointed for that purpose by His Grace, Archbishop E. J. Hanna of San Francisco, as attested to by his unqualified endorsement.

Our Pure Rubrical Altar Wines are also recommended by a large number of Archbishops, Bishops, Monsignors and Priests throughout the United States. For the convenience of the Reverend Clergy and Religious in the East we maintain a distributing station at No. 47-49 Barclay Street, New York City, N. Y., where at all times a large stock of all grades of our Pure Altar Wines are carried on hand.

The vineyards from which our wines are made are situated in the best wine belt of California, which is celebrated for the finest Altar Wines produced in that State.

Price Lists, Government Application Blanks, and Samples of all grades of our Pure Rubrical Altar Wines will be cheerfully furnished on request by our California or New York Offices.

ST. JOSEPH'S AGRICULTURAL INSTITUTE

Rutherford, Napa Valley, Cal.—Per Rev. D. O. Crowley

Beaulieu Vineyard
Office: 149 California St., San Francisco, Cal.
Per G. de Latour

Beaulieu Vineyard Distributing Co.
47-49 Barclay St., New York City, N. Y.
Per T. F. Rodden, Mgr.

STUDIES AND CONFERENCES:
Socialism and the Catholic Pulpit. (*The Rev. Herbert J. Parker, S.J., Manila, Philippine Islands*) 161
Importance of Rural Parishes. (*Inquirens*) 165
Why Should Priests be poor? (*Puller*) 167
A Pastoral Crusade Through the Holy Name Society. (*Rev. Joseph C. Fleming, New York City*) 170
Four Reasons Why Catholics May Not Lawfully Join a Masonic Lodge. (*The Rev. Manuel Peypoch, S.J.* 175
Maryknoll Mission Letters XXXVII: Impressions of Japan. (*The Rev. Philip S. Taggart, A.F.M., Yeungkong, China*) 178
The Printing of the Missal. (*Another Celebrant*). 177
Liturgical Blessings on the Vigil of the Epiphany 184
Responsibility for Defrauding an Insurance Company 186
The Three Crucifixes of Golgotha 189
Index of Forbidden Books 191
Obligation of the Nuptial Mass 192
Scruples or Sins? 193
Mass Offerings on All Souls' Day 193
Lights at Solemn Requiem Mass 194
Concerning Dances 195
Addition to Litany of the Saints 196
Prayer "Fidelium" in a "Missa pro Vivis" .. 196
Third Oration and the "Imperata" at Mass .. 197

ECCLESIASTICAL LIBRARY TABLE:
Recent Philosophical Literature. (*The Rev. Charles P. Bruehl, Ph.D., St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, Pa.*) 198

CRITICISMS AND NOTES:
Gore: The Return of Christendom 207
Middleton: Unity and Rome 207
Halifax: A Call to Reunion 207
——: The Churches of England 207
Palladino: Indian and White in Northwest .. 211
Gramatica: Bibliorum Sacrorum juxta Clementinam Versionem Nova Editio 213
Phelan: Priesthood of Christ 214
Page: Sacristan's Handbook 215

LITERARY CHAT 216
BOOKS RECEIVED 219

IT is a pleasure to announce the reprinting of the volume on the other side of this page, for it is a book which states clearly the eternal principles of the Christian social order, and does so in an illustrative and concrete fashion. The most acute problems that men and women are discussing to-day in their striving for Christian social reform is the subject matter of the work.

The whole life of Baron Von Ketteler, the energetic and intrepid Bishop of Mainz, is a story of absorbing interest. He was the pioneer of Christian social reform. Pope Leo XIII did not disdain to call him his great predecessor, and framed his famous Encyclical on Labor along the lines of Von Ketteler's program of action.

Priests are called upon to lead in social action, in the name of the Church They have St. Thomas as their teacher and guide in this book, under Bishop Von Ketteler's timely and practical interpretation. Both practical and timely it assuredly is. The challenge of these days, to know and apply the Catholic ideal to so-called Christian civilized society, is the same as in Bishop Von Ketteler's generation. The vision he had, and the practical means he took to translate it into action, are an inspiration for priests to-day.

Those who carefully read this book are convinced that it should be more widely known. It has been suggested as a valuable source of lecture material for Moderators of Holy Name Societies, and for social study clubs. We have no hesitation in recommending it as an interesting biography, replete with instances and principles that apply to the present social insecurity and unrest.

☞ **Subscribers should be on their guard against impostors who represent themselves as agents of the REVIEW. No one is authorized to collect money for the REVIEW.**

For Priests

To-Day

"The Church must not only act, but lead in social action, or lose."

Frequently described as the best book on the most important subject of the hour

Christian Social Reform

Program outlined by its Pioneer

BISHOP VON KETTELER

By George Metlake

CARDINAL O'CONNELL says in his Introduction to the volume: "Bishop Von Ketteler realized as no other man of his day, that in the new order of conditions the Church must not only act, but lead in social action, or lose. . . . We are face to face to-day with the conditions he met and set in order. What he did we must now strive to do."

ORDER THIS IMPORTANT BOOK TO-DAY—$1.50

American Ecclesiastical Review

1305 Arch Street The Dolphin Press PHILADELPHIA

THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

SEVENTH SERIES.—VOL. VIII.—(LXVIII).—FEBRUARY, 1923.—No. 2.

THE PETRINE CONFESSION.

SCRIPTURAL scholars are unanimous in regarding the confession made by St. Peter at Cæsarea-Philippi as a momentous event in the public life of Jesus of Nazareth. As to the content of that confession, critics are by no means agreed, but divide into widely divergent views. That Peter made a profession of faith in regard to the Person of Jesus which was so profound and perfect as to be exceedingly gratifying to the Master, is evident. But, whether Peter believed in his mind, and voiced by words his belief, that Jesus was the Son of God in the strict sense (and, therefore, true God), or only that He was the Messias (and, therefore, the Son of God in the broad sense), is a question much debated and about which even Catholic commentators [1] are not a unit. While the evidence for the Divinity of Jesus, even in the Synoptic Gospels, is abundant, there is no official Catholic teaching which commits us to finding a formal confession of that Divinity by St. Peter on the occasion in question. Doubtless that confession was a solemn one, and indicates a pivotal point in the public mission of our Saviour. For two whole years, spent chiefly in Galilee, He was engaged in educating His Apostles, impressing upon them by public signs and private conferences and by intimate personal association what His mission was, the nature of the Kingdom He had come to inaugurate, and (with greater reserve, however), who and what He was. Having now elicited from Peter's lips a formal profession of faith in His person and mission, He is satisfied that His immediate

[1] Dr. Tillmann in "Der Menschensohn" in *Biblische Zeitschrift* (Vol. 8, 1910) favors mere Messias.

followers have faith sufficiently well-informed and deep-rooted to stand the shock of the further announcement of the destiny of death that awaited their Master. Henceforth, Jesus turns His face toward Jerusalem, where His lifework is to be consummated by an ignominious death, which He foresees and often foretells, to save His disciples from perversion by the scandal of the Cross.

The interesting question, then, we propose to study in the light of the Gospel evidence, and without any prepossession as to the conclusion, and while giving full weight to the arguments available for either side, is: What is the exact and full content of Peter's confession? Did he confess Jesus to be merely the Christ, to which title, "Son of God" is added by Peter or by Matthew as a synonym in apposition, without any recognition and acknowledgment of the deep mystery of the Godhead of Christ? Or, did Peter confess at once both the Messianic mission and the Divine character of Jesus, so that a theologian is justified in quoting (as is commonly done) Peter's words as a proof of the Divinity of Jesus Christ?

The solemn confession is recorded in all three of the Synoptic Gospels. The narrative of Matthew may be adduced as the more complete and graphic, while comparisons with Mark and Luke must be made in the course of the disquisition. The simple but impressive tale of Matthew 16: 13-16, runs thus:

> Now when Jesus came into the parts of Cæsarea-Philippi, He asked His disciples saying, Who do men say that the Son of Man is? But they said: Some John the Baptist, and other some Elias, and others Jeremias or one of the prophets. Jesus saith to them: But whom do you say that I am? Simon Peter answered and said: Thou art the Christ the Son of the living God. And Jesus answering said to him: Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona, because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven.

Now, from the impressive eulogy bestowed on the chief Apostle, and because his profession of faith is declared to be due to a special revelation, it is manifest that Peter attested a truth that was unusual and striking. On this account many insist that the Apostle confessed the Divinity of Jesus, for surely the fact that Jesus was the Messias was a truth already well known to the Apostles. This last statement is a postulate

worthy of close investigation. For, if the Apostles had unmistakably accepted and admitted the Messiahship of their Master prior to the time of the incident at Cæsarea-Philippi, the advocates of the confession of the Divinity have an easy case as against those who claim confession of mere Messiahship. For, how vain and exaggerated is praise given one for the possession of knowledge which is common property! Let us examine in the first place, then, what arguments the advocates of mere Messiahship can furnish in defence of their interpretation.

To meet the difficulty just raised, and to give antecedent probability to their case, they admit that Peter did confess something original and unusual; but this was not the Divinity of Jesus, so much as His Messiahship in the genuine Christian sense of the Messianic office *such as it was preached by Jesus,* and not in the popular sense of contemporary Jewish expectation; that is, Peter saw in Jesus the spiritual Messias,[2] whose mission was to save mankind by the conquest of sin and Satan, and the establishment of the reign of God in the heart of man, rather than the Messias of popular hope,[3] whose primary work was political and who would glorify Israel by smashing her foes and making of her an ideal nation with universal political and moral sway. Peter, then, deservedly attracted the special praise of the Master, because he was the first who was inspired to confess openly and with abiding conviction His true Messianic character.

[2] "When Jesus declared Himself the Messiah to His disciples and to the chief priest, He wished to say that He was 'He who was to come', that it was useless to expect another prophet, or any other intervention of God in human affairs, that He was the last revealer of the heavenly Father, the founder of a universal, final religion. For us even to-day the formula 'Jesus is the Christ' has no other sense."—Rose, *Studies on the Gospels* (Longmans, 1903), p. 174.

[3] "Il faut remarquer surtout que la conception messianique n'était pas à cette époque une donée ferme et simple, telle que toute reconnaissance de Jésus comme Christ dût avoir toujours et pour tous le même sens determiné. L'Élu des paraboles d'Hénoch ne ressemblait pas au roi du psaume xvii de Salomon, et ni l'un ni l'autre n'était identique au Messie d'Esdras; l'évangile nous montre, autour du Christ, les mêmes incertitudes et les mêmes contradictions: pour beaucoup, c'est le fils de David, et il doit naître à Bethleem; d'autres pensent qu'il se manifestera soudain, sans que personne sache d'où il vient; quelques-uns l'attendent comme un maître, qui doit apprendre toute chose; la plupart, comme un roi, qui doit restaurer Israël; quelques-uns, comme un personnage surnaturel, qui apparaîtra sur les nuées."—Lebreton, *Les Origines du Dogme de la Trinité*, p. 230; Paris, 1910.

In support of this contention, they examine in detail previous human confessions (for the purpose of the argument involved Jesus's own earlier testimonies to His Godhead, which, while giving evidence sufficient to satisfy us in the light of our fuller faith, might be unintelligible to His slow-witted followers, and the testimonies of demoniacs who have more than mortal penetration, are not pertinent) of Jesus as "the Christ", or, "the Son of God", or, "the Holy One of God", and endeavor to show that such testimonies were but surmises, or momentary flashes or admissions of "Messias" in the nationalistic Jewish sense, and of "Son of God" in the broad sense of a chosen one or a prophet of God, or, at best, the theocratic king who should rule visibly over the Messianic Kingdom of Israel restored. For we must admit that the title, "Son of God", is used in the broad sense of God's chosen representative in the Old Testament;[4] and even of Jesus in some parts of the New Testament. For instances can be adduced where He is admiringly proclaimed the Son of God, as in the case of Nathaniel, of the boat-man, and of the centurion, where the speakers have probably no knowledge of His Divinity.[5] Besides, if previous confessions of "Son of God" were confessions of the Divinity, the argument can be turned equally against Peter's merits in proclaiming Jesus's Divinity as well as His Messiahship. So, from this viewpoint, an equally good (or bad) case can be made out for the originality of Peter's confession of genuine Messias as of true Son of God.

The champions of this view claim to find in the Gospel record of Peter's confession itself support for their interpretation. That Peter's confession, as expressed by Matthew in the words: "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God", mean no more than if he said: "Thou art the Messias", is clear from the parallel passages in Mark and Luke. Mark reproduces Peter's confession in the words: "Thou art the Christ"; while Luke records simply: "The Christ[6] of God". That Matthew's form of the confession must be interpreted by

[4] In the Old Testament: "la paternité de Dieu ne suppose qu'une providence specialement attentive et bienveillante pour le peuple divin et pour le roi théocratique."—Rose, *St. Matthew*, p. 127.

[5] Jo. 1:49; Mt. 14:33; 27:54.

[6] Mk. 8:29; Luke 9:20.

the forms given in the other two Synoptics is upheld by the context in Matthew. For the narrative of the incident in the first Gospel concludes thus: "Then He commanded His disciples that they should tell no man that He was *the Christ.*"[7] Here, then, even Jesus Himself interprets for us the significance of the confession, as being nothing else than that of Messiahship.

But was it not well known already that Jesus was the Christ (the Messias)? This is an assumption which the advocates of the foregoing theory challenge. A critical examination of the Gospel history prior to this epoch, they claim, will show that there was no such recognition of Jesus's Messianic character even among His intimate associates. Why this should be is a matter to be presently explained. This does not mean that Jesus was not accepted as a great, yea even as the greatest, of prophets; as the Holy One of God; and the Son of God (in the broad sense), endowed with marvellous supernatural powers, yes, and God's beloved Son whom man should hear and whose heavenly mission was to preach and establish the Kingdom of God. The deeper implications of many of these titles and the powers were not yet fully comprehended even by the disciples, as we are often assured by the Evangelists themselves.[8]

A fact worthy of due attention, and quite relevant to the present argument, is the answer of the Apostles to Jesus's inquiry: "Who do men say that I am (or that the Son of Man is)?" They answer: "Some say John the Baptist, some Elias, others Jeremias or one of the prophets". Note well that at this stage in His public mission, after He had preached publicly for about two years and wrought all kinds of miracles, the Apostles are unable to report any class among "the multitude" as saying that Jesus is the Messias! Hence, Peter's confession shines out by contrast with the various opinions reported. And note besides that the Apostles are admonished to keep secret their belief in His Messiahship. For a proper understanding of this situation the manner of Jesus's manifestation of Himself must be considered.

[7] Mt. 16:20.

[8] Mk. 6:52; 7:17; 8:17-21.

As an all-wise teacher, Jesus was not free to reveal at the outset, and abruptly, the full burden of His mission, and the awful character of His person as Messias and Son of God. He observed a method of pedagogical reserve best calculated to attain His purpose. His was the duty of sifting the chaff from the wheat—of having Himself accepted as the fulfillment of the elements of truth in the Messianic hope that burned in the breasts of the Jewish people, while eliminating the false, perverted notions that had clustered round this inspiring hope. It would have been fatal (humanly speaking) for Jesus to proclaim publicly that He was the Messias at the beginning of His public mission. For the intensely patriotic and secular-minded Jews would have taken Him at His word (as we know they did in the case of certain imposters who claimed to be the Messias) and, accepting His Messiahship in the nationalist and political sense, they would have attempted to impose on Him the rôle of King of Israel; and starting a general revolt against the Roman Tyranny, they would bring about a condition of universal chaos such as eventuated some forty years later at the Fall of Jerusalem. This prospect was so repugnant to the Prince of Peace, whose mission was purely spiritual, and whose warfare was not against earthly thrones or secular princes, but against the empire of sin and Satan, that He observed all the more caution lest such an ebullition might be provoked. In fact, He was at a loss to repress undue publication of His Messianic and miraculous powers by those (such as the demoniacs and the Apostles) who knew Him to be the Messias. And when the people surmised, because of His astounding miracles and exercise of authority that He was the Messias, and would have seized Him and made Him King,[9] so far from encouraging the idea and accepting the honor, He rather repressed the sentiment and sought safety in flight. Little wonder, then, that the people at large, instead of growing stronger in the conviction, rather dismissed the thought that He could be the Messias who shrank from accepting the office and failed so miserably to measure up to their glorious expectations of what He ought to be! Hence at the time of Peter's grand confession (which rose triumphant over humble

[9] Mk. 12:23; Jo. 6:14.

appearances and antecedent prejudices, and, with the aid of divine light, penetrated into the heart of truth) the multitude who had witnessed Jesus's words and works admitted at best that He was John the Baptist, or Elias, or Jeremias, or some other one of the old prophets risen again.

Jesus, so far from prematurely revealing Himself as the Messias, prepared the way for the recognition of this fact by His Apostles by a gradual unfolding of the true spiritual nature of His mission, of His doctrine, and of His person. He revealed Himself more by works than words, more by implication and assumption than by formal claims. Those of good-will who accept Him now for what He is and does and because of the Divine credentials made manifest in His life, will in due time accept Him for all that He claims to be—the Messias, and Only-begotten Son of God. A brief résumé [10] of the pedagogic method, at once reserved and progressive, pursued by Jesus in the manifestations of His Messiahship, might be presented here with interest and illumination. He began by preaching the Kingdom of God, as John the Baptist had done, and as He commanded His disciples to do. His first disciples attached themselves to Him as a Divine teacher or prophet without any clear idea that He was the Messias. He is to make them fishers of men, that is, preachers of the Kingdom and coöperators with His work and mission.[11] If He does not enlighten them on the exact nature of the Kingdom from the outset the reason is because He did not wish to shock them by a too abrupt disillusionment. He observes a discreet reserve in gradually educating them into the knowledge of the moral nature of the Kingdom and the non-political rôle of the Messias. He allows the unfolding of events and the impressive lessons of His weighty deeds, rather than explicit verbal instructions, to effect a progressive modification of these preconceptions. They are His constant companions, the witnessing of His miracles, and the attentive auditors of His daily discourses. They see Him vindicate the power of forgiving sins and declare Himself Master of the Sabbath. They hear the possessed proclaim Him the Son of God. By parables, which half conceal and half reveal (according to the disposi-

[10] Cf. Mangenot, *Les Evangiles Synoptiques*, p. 272; Paris, 1911.

[11] Mk. 1:14-17; Mt. 4:17-19.

tions of the listener), and by private explanations He instructs them in the nature of the Kingdom. By calming the tempest, He compels their admiration for His mysterious power. In the country of the Gerasens they see Jesus accept the title of the Son of the Most High God from the lips of the demoniac, and having expelled the legion of devils, He orders the possessed man to make public the great things done for him by the Lord. They witness His raising to life the daughter of Jairus, but are enjoined to silence. Later they distribute the loaves and fishes, miraculously multiplied by Him; and see Him walk upon the water—both of which acts elicit their worshipful astonishment and give rise to the passing exclamation that He is the Son of God, the prophet to come, the King of Israel, and even the Holy One of God. As yet, they fail to comprehend the full import of His miracles, and the deeper significance of His discourses, as we are plainly assured by the Evangelists.[12]

Such was the reserved but progressive process of education by which Jesus led the Apostles on till the time was ripe to elicit the full and formal confession made by St. Peter. The Master's interrogation provokes the response. The Apostles enumerate the various opinions held by the people concerning Him and His works. Jesus stops not to contradict these views in which He knew His chosen ones did not share; but directly proceeds to ask what they themselves believed. Then Peter gave bold expression to his inmost conviction, and which Jesus joyously confirms. The immortal confession, differently phrased by the different Evangelists, was (according to the view here expounded) the first thorough recognition and perfect profession of faith by mortal man (if we except the Baptist) that Jesus, the Galilean prophet, was truly the Messias. Behold the faith which is considered sufficiently staunch to withstand the shock of the scandal of the Cross which Jesus presently announces!

To round off and reïnforce this portion of our study it is necessary to consider a few special passages in the Gospel history that antedate the incident of Cæsarea-Philippi. For these seem to show that the Apostles knew, or ought to have

[12] Mk. 2:5-28; 3:12; 4:40; 5; 6; Mt. 14:33; Jo. 6:15-70; Mk. 6:32; 7:17; 8:17-21.

known, and actually confessed, previously the Messiahship of Jesus. But a few preliminary remarks will restrict the number of passages to be reviewed. Only such evidence as could have illumined the minds and influenced the belief of *the Apostles* during *the first two years* of their acquaintance with Jesus is relevant to the present problem. For other evidence, such as the Gospel of the Infancy contains, and such as the Evangelists later gathered from many authoritative sources and incorporated in their sacred text, and which furnishes us with much matter in proof of the Messiahship and even of the Divinity of the Son of Mary, was not then available to the early disciples. Farther, we must not imagine that admiration for Jesus as a great prophet (made manifest by His miracles and doctrinal authority) or even proclaiming Him (as often happened) the Son of God, was equivalent to, or identical with, confessing Him to be the Messias. On the authority of the distinguished scholar, Jules Lebreton, who made an exhaustive study of the Scriptural evidence of the dogma of the Blessed Trinity, we can affirm that to the contemporaries of Jesus, "la locution 'Fils du Dieu' n'était point reçue communément pour désigner le Messie, et ne se recontrait jamais en ce sens, ni dans l'Ancien Testament, ni dans les Apocryphes juifs, il faut bien expliquer cet usage nouveau par une croyance nouvelle." [13] Even the title, "Son of Man", used so frequently by Jesus, and very likely in a Messianic sense, was not recognized by the people as an equivalent of Messias, unless (as happened before the Sanhedrin), coupled with the glorious advent in the clouds of heaven, when the claim of being the One foretold by Daniel was instantly realized.[14] The title was understood in its usual Hebrew sense (apart from its prophetic association) as a man, a member of the human race, one born of man, and so could be used with perfect security against premature revelation of His Messiahship. A final consideration is that the Apostles in their pre-Pentecostal days were by no means apt pupils to catch every intimation or implicit revelation given by the Master in regard to His office and person. In fact, they were rather obtuse in grasping the obvious meaning of many of His impressive

[13] *Les Origines*, p. 246.

[14] Rose, *Studies*, ch. V, and Mt. 16:27; 26:64; Dan. 7:13.

miracles and discourses. Hence, what for us of fuller faith and more critical minds would be a clear disclosure of Messianic character on Jesus's part, might leave them unimpressed and unillumined.

Now, the particular passages which are difficult to reconcile with the view defended, because they seem to bear witness to the fact that the Apostles had previously known and confessed that Jesus was the Messias, must be examined. When John the Baptist at the Jordan proclaimed Jesus to be the Lamb of God, two of his disciples transferred their allegiance to Jesus. After they had spent a day in His company, one of them, Andrew, came and announced to his brother, Peter: "We have found the Messias". Next day Philip becomes a disciple, and straightway finds Nathaniel, and informs him: "We have found Him of whom Moses and the prophets did write—Jesus, the son of Joseph from Nazareth". Nathaniel, his doubts and prejudices dispelled by the Divine intuition displayed by Jesus, enthusiastically pronounces Him to be "the Son of God . . . . the King of Israel".[15] When Jesus had multiplied the loaves and fishes, the people were so impressed with the stupendous miracle that they joyously exclaimed: "This is the prophet who is to come into the world"; [16] and, had He not fled, they would have seized Him and made Him King. And when many were scandalized and deserted Him because of His mysterious discourse on the Eucharist, Peter expresses the devoted loyalty of the Apostles in the words: "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life.[17] And we have believed, and we have known that Thou art the Christ, the Son of God." In the Synagogue at Nazareth, Jesus read the Messianic passages from Isaias: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me: wherefore He hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; He hath sent me to heal the contrite of heart, to preach deliverance to captives, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of reward." Then, after He had folded the book, He declared in the midst of solemn and expectant silence: "This day is fulfilled this Scripture in your ears".[18] When the Baptist heard in prison of the great works

[15] Jo. 1:41; 4:5; 4:9.
[16] Jo. 6:14.
[17] Jo.6:70.
[18] Is. 61:1; Lk. 4:21.

of Jesus, he sent two of his disciples to ask Him: "Art thou he that is to come, or look we for another?" Jesus pointed to the miracles He had just wrought before the eyes of the messengers, and answered: "Go and relate to John what you have heard and seen: the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead rise again, the poor have the gospel preached to them; and blessed is he that shall not be scandalized in Me." [19] By His Messianic works foretold by Isaias, and by His later words of praise in regard to John, as the "angel-precursor" and the "Elias that is to come", and about the Kingdom now being stormed, Jesus clearly points Himself out as the Messias. Again, when Jesus had cured the man who was at once blind, mute, and possessed, the crowd exclaimed: "Is not this the Son of David?"; [20] but the Pharisees at once repressed the surmise by maliciously ascribing the miracle to Beelzebub. In fine, when Jesus quelled the storm, walked upon the water, and saved Peter from being submerged, those in the boat adored Him, saying: "Indeed, thou art the Son of God." [21]

Such, then, is the formidable array of witnesses to belief in the Messiahship of Jesus prior to the confession of St. Peter, which the champion of the Messias-view expounded must do battle with if his victory is to pass unchallenged. For we may safely assume that in the instances enumerated, the Apostles either overheard and admitted the testimony of others, or themselves confessed that Jesus was the Messias. Where, then, are the originality and merit of the Petrine confession of mere Messiahship? Personally, we frankly admit the difficulty involved, once the texts quoted are conceded to be historically accurate and chronologically anterior to the Cæsarean confession. But such explanation as may, with some show of justice, be suggested we gladly present, leaving its validity to the critical judgment of maturer scholars.

The confessions of Andrew and Philip, and Nathaniel, made at the Jordan on their first meeting with Jesus, were but the outbursts of the Messianic enthusiasm of the moment, and were provoked by the authority of John the Baptist. They were not the outcome of deep-seated conviction or mature reflection.

[19] Mt. 11:5; Is. 35:5; 61:1.

[20] Mt. 12:23.

[21] Mt. 14:33.

and at best took Jesus for the Christ of popular Jewish fancy and expectation. A long period of formation and education was needed before the Apostles could come to the truer recognition of the spiritual Messianic mission of Jesus, which reached its climax in the Petrine confession. Even the Evangelist, to whom we are indebted for the record of the events at the Jordan, ascribes *the faith* of the disciples in Jesus to His later miracles, as at the wedding feast of Cana.[22] While the Apostles had abundant grounds for believing in Jesus as a great prophet and representative of God, how sorely tried and how very imperfect must be their faith in Him as the Christ because of the violent contrast between the material splendor and visible glory of the imagined Expected One, and the humble habiliments of the Master who shunned all display and fled from public acclaim. Despite all Jesus could do to disillusion and illumine them, time and again even to the close of His earthly career we find traces of the tenacity with which some of them clung to the old conceit of a national chieftain and a political potentate.[23]

The impulse of the people, after the miracle of the loaves and fishes, to make Jesus their Messianic king, was momentary, and was nipped in the bud by His refusal to accept the rôle. If *the words* of Peter's profession of loyalty, when many disciples deserted at the close of the Eucharistic discourse, were authentic, we should have here an expression of faith that in bold grandeur and in fulness would eclipse the subsequent confession at Cæsarea. But, according to the best textual critics, the original words of Peter were: "We have believed and we have known that Thou art the Holy One of God".[24] Now, this title, sublime in itself and used on previous occasions by demoniacs,[25] does not necessarily nor explicitly signify the Messias. Jesus's identification of Himself with the Messias in His discourse in the Synagogue at Nazareth, and in His reply to John, was by no means explicit, and its full significance could easily escape minds not well versed in Messianic pro-

[22] Jo. 2:11.

[23] Mk. 10:37; Lk. 24:21; Acts 1:6.

[24] Cf. Tischendorf's or Vogels' ad Jo. 6:70 σὺ εἶ ὁ ἅγιος τοῦ θεοῦ is the best Greek reading).

[25] Mk. 1:24; cf. Hastings, *Dict. of Christ and the Gospels*, art. "Holy One"; Scribners', 1911.

phecy, nor alert to the manner and motive of Jesus's pedagogic reserve, and obscured by false and distorted hopes. What is to us so obvious in the bright light of centuries of Christian history and experience and with the complete page of Christ's life unfolded to our disciplined gaze, might have been dim and perplexing to the limited vision of Jesus's contemporaries. Only by slow and laborious stages did the truth dawn upon the disciples that their Master was after all, and despite His contradiction of many cherished preconceptions, the *Messias*.

The two remaining instances were momentary exclamations or surmises evoked by the marvellous miracles witnessed. The former but asks, "Is not this the Son of David?"; and the latter reveals the boatmen overawed by the great power of Jesus, and, prostrate at His feet, exclaiming: "Indeed, thou art *a Son* of God"—as expressed in the original Greek. In the light of this hurried review and interpretation is there not much justification for the opinions that the first full, formal, and exact recognition and confession that Jesus was the Messias was made at Cæsarea-Phillippi? And that such a profession of Messiahship, apart from intuition of, and belief in, His Divinity, adequately explains the lavish encomium of Jesus? What may be said for the rival view we shall present in another contribution.

C. F. CREMIN.

St. Paul, Minnesota.

REUNION FALLACIES.

I.

THE "Reunion of Christendom" is a term of late years more than formerly in use amongst non-Catholics in relation to a need and a desire felt by them for reunion amongst themselves and if possible eventually with Rome.

The Eastern Churches for centuries have remained to all appearance contentedly in schism, though there have not been wanting from time to time efforts here and there for a return to the allegiance from which they were torn. Recent changes, moreover, in relation to the temporal powers by which their national divisions have so long been dominated may likewise have induced here and there a desire for return to the centre

of Catholic unity—to the one only authority and ecclesiastical jurisdiction that has proved strong enough to withstand the interference of the civil power in the domain of religion.

The Anglican communion, in common with Protestantism generally, likewise until the time of the Tractarian Movement remained for the most part contentedly in isolation from the Catholic Church. But another spirit now animates many Anglicans, though not with one and the same aim in view. Alive now as never so much in former times to the scandal of divisions amongst Christians and the grievous obstacles in consequence to the conversion of the heathen abroad and of unbelievers at home, the Anglican bishops are seeking reunion with Nonconformist Protestants, not however without overtures toward Easterns and exchange of civilities with them. They propose as a sufficient basis of reunion with their Nonconformist brethren, "the Holy Scriptures as the rule of faith, the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as the statement of the Faith, the Two Sacraments ordained by Christ Himself, the historic episcopate locally adapted in the methods of its administration to varying needs". The "Anglo-Catholic" section of the Anglican communion, on the other hand, having suffered a sufficiently painful experience of heresies within the borders of their communion, have no desire to extend its borders for a further increase of them. Their efforts therefore for the present are directed toward reunion with Easterns, and they assure them that the true religion of their Church includes Seven Sacraments and is in all respects substantially identical with that of the Eastern Orthodox Churches.

Now, what have the Eastern authorities to say in reply to the friendly overtures of the Anglican bishops, and incidentally to "Anglo-Catholics" also? The Report of the Delegation sent by the Patriarch of Constantinople to the Lambeth Conference describes the Anglican conception of the Catholic Church as being quite uncatholic and peculiar to Anglicans:

> The idea of the Church among them is much wider than ours. While with us the true member of the Church who continues in organic union with the whole must accept the whole of our teaching, share canonically in the holy Sacraments, and believe in lawfully settled ecclesiastical principles, in the English Church men differing from each other in faith, not only in things indifferent and non-

essential, constitute one undivided whole. These things being so, it is very easy to understand that they perceive no difficulty in sacramental intercourse with us, whom also they look upon generally as representing the ancient undivided Church, yet that we do perceive a difficulty as we find ourselves, to crown all, face to face with the still not finally solved questions of the validity or non-validity, the canonicity or non-canonicity of Anglican orders. To however great an extent, in conformity with our mission, we were inspired with the most friendly feelings and the warmest zeal for a new approach, we could not agree to views of such a nature without abandoning the foundation on which essentially our Church is built. This was our original view, and after our stay in England we were the more persuaded that excessive tolerance of latitude and complacency toward heterodox religious views, and intercommunion without previous understanding and agreement regarding dogma and teaching, is not the way which leads to a sure and safe union of the Christian Churches.

It should be obvious therefore to the Anglican bishops that the most they can hope for is reunion with Protestant Nonconformists. And to "Anglo-Catholics" it should be equally obvious that before they can hope for union with the East it is necessary for them to go out from their heterodox brethren and be separate from the Anglican communion, since they cannot fail to see that, honey-combed with heresies as that communion is, it is not in a position as a whole for reunion with the East.

But more especially should it be obvious alike to "Anglo-Catholics" and their bishops that their respective efforts toward reunion are based on precisely the same principles as those which brought about disunion—in the one case in relation to the Churches of the East, and in the other to the numerous divisions of Protestantism.

Nationalism in place of Catholicism, with Erastian government in place of the Papal, explains the origin and continuance of the Eastern schism; and national antipathies and quarrels, fostered and exploited by ecclesiastics, and still more by civil rulers for political ends, have prevailed to divide the Eastern Orthodox communion into seventeen national Churches independent each of the rest in government. "Anglo-Catholics" in their efforts after reunion with the East forget that the root cause of the Anglican isolation from Christendom is likewise this same assertion of national independence and rejection of

papal jurisdiction. They fail to see that, did their efforts succeed, they would but prevail to accentuate and increase the evil and still further retard the hope of reunion with Rome, which after all is the ultimate goal of their ambition. Surely they have had enough of nationalism and Erastianism in religion without seeking union with more of it.

The overtures of the Anglican bishops with a view to reunion with Protestant Nonconformists are likewise based on precisely the same principle of private judgment which resulted in disunion. "The Holy Scriptures as the rule of faith," with no provision of an authority to interpret the rule, leaves them as hitherto to the interpretation of the sect or of the private individual. "The Apostles' and Nicene Creeds as the statement of the Faith" need mean no more than a bare statement involving no definite belief in their several articles, since as a matter of fact the statement is freely recited in solemn service by Anglican divines themselves who are quite at liberty to deny even such fundamental truths as those of our Lord's Divinity, Birth as Man of a Virgin, and the Resurrection of His Body after death. "Two Sacraments" only need be admitted as "ordained by Christ Himself," and these of course as at present amongst Anglicans themselves in any sense, even to the denial of their very nature and essence *as* sacraments. "The historic episcopate locally adapted in the methods of its administration to varying needs" is obviously thus designedly worded in such sufficiently vague language as to admit of acceptance of but the bare title—though Nonconformists have not been slow to show that even so they will have none of it. Now, what would be the worth of such reunion beyond agreement to differ as before, together at best with friendly interchange of ministrations, scarcely likely to remain friendly for long, and by reason of the divisions amongst Anglicans themselves certain of but partial acceptance. Such reunion would in truth quite manifestly embrace all the former elements of disunion. But observe—with this aggravation, namely, the superadded scandal of uniting to proclaim to the world that no importance and therefore no definite belief need any longer be attached to doctrines, however fundamental, which hitherto for centuries have held Protestants in numerous sects apart. It is passing strange indeed that men who claim

to be ambassadors for Christ do not see that His truth does not admit of compromise, and that unity in truth requires that all who are so united profess one and the same body of truth in all its parts as of *Divine revelation,* not human opinion—as requiring the obedience of faith, and therefore not subject to controversy.

It is observable also that in these efforts toward reunion Anglicans make little or no account of a *Centre of Unity.* Yet surely for so supernatural a union in religion as that of a worldwide Christendom embracing vast multitudes of all nations and races, differing so widely in all things else, and often even at war among themselves; as also for the preservation of their religious unity all through the world's vicissitudes and revolutions, a Centre of Unity is essentially necessary and must therefore have been provided—*Divinely* provided, since such unity obviously transcends the power of man. It cannot have been left to Christians to provide it for themselves by mere ecclesiastical arrangement and mutual consent. Yet, our separated brethren do not appear so much as to ask themselves whether such a Centre exists, whether the one Centre of Catholic unity that in fact is to be found may not after all be the Centre intended by Him who saw the future from the beginning and knew what would be the outcome of His commission and promise to St. Peter. And if they do at times look wistfully toward St. Peter's successor, it is but with a vague hope that he may modify his claim to supremacy in the interests of reunion with those who do not believe in his Divinely bestowed prerogative; that in effect he will dissolve the Papacy and substitute in place of it a human centre of merely ecclesiastical consent, regardless of the consequences to the faith and allegiance of hundreds of millions all over the face of the earth who so loyally hold to it as of Divine, not human, appointment and preservation, and are everywhere held by it in a visible unity of religion which transcends all the vicissitudes of time and place, since it comes not of earth, holds not of earth, but has its source where there is neither time nor place, nor change, nor shadow of alteration—the Person of our Lord.

II.

If one were asked for the most convincing characteristic and note of the Catholic Church one could not do better than insist upon the one that was in the mind of our Lord Himself when He prayed the Father: "That they all may be One, as Thou, Father, in Me, and I in Thee; that they also may be one in Us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me . . . that they may be made perfect in One; and the world may know." Such was His prayer and intention on His way to His passion and death for "the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own Blood". Thus did He pray for His apostles whom He had commissioned to "teach all nations". "And not for them only, do I pray, but for them also who through their word shall believe in Me." He prayed "that they all may be One" in a Unity indissoluble as that which subsists between the Father and Himself; a Unity everywhere and always visible as an indispensable note by which "the world may believe" and "know" the truth of His mission; a Unity against which "the gates of hell shall not prevail".

And this Unity was in fact bestowed at Pentecost. "Mary, the Mother of Jesus," with the eleven apostles and the disciples, numbering in all "about a hundred and twenty", "were all together in one place", "persevering with one mind in prayer". Then, under Peter's authority and direction the vacancy in the apostolate was filled, and all was in readiness and expectancy for the coming of the Paraclete, proceeding from the Father and the Son, to infuse into the infant Church the life by which it should grow and increase and spread into all the world in visible unity of organization and communion, "that the world may believe and know" in accordance with the commission to "teach all nations".

In that same day, "filled with the Holy Ghost," Peter and the eleven "began to speak with divers tongues, according as the Holy Ghost gave them to speak," to the multitude "gathered out of every nation under heaven"; and to the visible unity of the infant Church "there were added in that day about three thousand souls," a number which "the Lord increased daily," and to which there were shortly added "five thousand". And in this our day "the unity of the Spirit" is manifested

by the hundreds of millions of "every tribe and tongue and people and nation" gathered into the Visible Unity of the Catholic Church—a unity essentially indivisible *because* "the unity of the Spirit".

Some there were even in that earliest age of the Church who separated themselves from this unity. St. John writes of them: "They went out from us, but they were not of us." They could not take a "part" of the Church with them; they were "not of" it. "For," as St. Cyprian observes, "the Church is One, and this One cannot be both within and without . . . nor is it capable of being split up against itself nor divided."[1] Schism is not a dividing of the Church into "parts"; it constitutes a separation from the whole. The Church is "One Body", essentially indivisible into parts, and never can become an aggregation of separated parts. The Holy Spirit manifests its Unity by its union in *communion* as well as in government and organization. Separation from this Unity is as separation of a limb from the human body; the soul remains in the body and does not accompany the separated limb; the limb is lost to both body and soul. In like manner the Catholic Church, essentially One visible Body, necessarily exists everywhere in unity of organism and communion. Separation from this unity of the Body involves separation from "the unity of the Spirit", who, since He cannot be divided, remains in the Body of whose unity He is both author and life, and therefore does not accompany separations from it. In saying this of course it is not denied that the Holy Spirit sanctifies those who are not of the Catholic Church; He sanctifies all who are of good will and in good faith; and often non-Catholics put lax Catholics to shame! What is here insisted upon is that, like as a man's soul does not accompany a limb separated from his body, so neither do separations from the Church live still as parts of it in "the unity of the Spirit". He is the life of the Church in its unity, not of separations from it. St. Cyprian,[2] speaking of this Unity, says again that it "cannot be severed, nor can the one body be separated by division of its structure"; and St. Augustine[3] declares that

[1] Ep. Magno. LXIX, p. 182. Ed. Oxford, 1632.

[2] P. 119, Oxford Ed. 1632.

[3] Contra Donat., No. 7, Vol. IX, p. 342. Venice. 1733.

"even those who believe all the doctrines of Christ, but nevertheless so disagree with His body the Church, that their communion is not with the whole wheresoever it is spread, but is found in some place separated—such are manifestly not in the Church." For the Holy Spirit manifests His unity by indwelling *one* communion, not several — one communion spread through the world and everywhere at unity with itself. Communions that are not in communion with this One, obviously are not one communion with it, and therefore manifestly are not of the same Visible Church.

Now, the Eastern and Anglican communions lie each of them separate from the worldwide communion of Rome, separate each from the other, and both of them confined to national territory. The notion that they form along with the communion of Rome "parts" of one and the same Visible Church is purely Anglican. Easterns do not admit any such claim. On the contrary, however surprising it may seem, and is, yet consistently enough they contend that their communion, though so confined by locality, is *exclusively* the Catholic Church. For, likewise as Rome, they too insist that the Church is wholly one, and that their communion is therefore the whole of it. Thus the Anglican theory of a Catholic Church divided into parts and consisting of three visibly separated communions is repudiated alike by Rome and the East, and the Anglican claim to be one of these parts along with the Eastern communion as another, finds no more favor with Easterns than with Rome. In their overtures toward reunion with the East, Anglicans would do well to weigh this. Communion with Easterns would involve acceptance of the Eastern position and abandonment of their own, together with the loss of all hope of reunion with Rome.

III.

Lord Halifax, for so long a deservedly revered and beloved leader amongst Anglicans, admits that the Anglican conception of the constitution of the Catholic Church differs from the Catholic conception. He might have added that it differs from the Eastern also. The great question in the controversy is thus simplified. Which is the true conception?

Cardinal Newman aptly describes the Gospel of Christ as "a substantive message from above, guarded and preserved in a visible polity"—a visible polity or kingdom coëxtensive with "all nations", independent of civil rulers and national frontiers in the domain of religion, and governed therefore from an extra-national centre. "This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony to all nations." Such was the intention and command of our Lord, coupled also with the promise to Peter, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it". Only under the jurisdiction of St. Peter's successors has this been fulfilled; and so will it be fulfilled until the end, for "the gates of hell shall not prevail" to make of the kingdom of Christ "a kingdom divided against itself". The Catholic Church thus constituted occupies the *orbis terrarum* as a visible and indivisible whole alike in communion as in polity and government. It is the mystical Body of Christ essentially indestructible and therefore indivisible in constitution, and "in the unity of the Spirit" visibly *one communion*. Thus has our Lord provided "that the world may believe and may know the truth of His mission. But to the world the Anglican conception is manifestly unintelligible, and the Eastern impudently reduces the Catholic Church to a merely Eastern communion!

Thus over and against the visibly worldwide kingdom of Christ, so luminously "not of this world" though in it, are these national Churches of the East and the Anglican communion, pieced out in the interests of kingdoms of this world, and in addition to these a babel of sects. What human policy of compromise and comprehension can be supposed to avail toward their reunion amongst themselves and with the Catholic Church! And how can the latter be expected to sacrifice its head and unity in the interests of any such compromise and comprehension! Yet, strange as it may seem, such are the dreams of Anglicans—though *not* of Easterns!

Do Anglicans really look for a change in the attitude of Rome? Do they pause, if for but a brief moment, to reflect how such change as they hope for would affect the faith and allegiance of the hundreds of millions all over the earth who are united under the Pope as the vicegerent of Christ? What would these think of sacrifice of his Divinely bestowed pre-

rogative, of confession that the communion of Rome was not the whole Church, but only a "part" of it, and had all along erred in not recognizing the Eastern and Anglican communions as equally with itself parts of it, and that henceforth the Papacy was subject to their consent? Imagine the consternation that would prevail throughout the world amongst Christians numbering more than twice the number of those in whose favor they were called upon to make such concessions! How could they any longer believe in a Church which thus stultified its position, identity, constitution, personality, and confessed that it had been deceived and for centuries had deceived countless millions of Christians, with canonized saints amongst them! How indeed would Anglicans themselves regard a Church which thus contradicted itself and denied its infallibility! *Dissolutionem facis, pacem appellas.* Such concessions as Anglicans look for from Rome, so far from furthering the cause of reunion, would in fact effectually destroy all hope of it; to ask for them is to ask the Pope to dissolve Christendom! In Rome's uncompromising attitude lies in truth the one only hope of union. In St. Augustine's words, the Papal is "Christ's Unity"; as well ask our Lord Himself as ask His vicar to change it! Catholic Unity has all along been in evidence; there is no question as to its loss, but only of the return of those who have separated and remain separate from it.

"As the Church grew into form, so did the power of the Pope develop; and wherever the Pope has been renounced, decay and division have been the consequences. We know of no other way of preserving the *Sacramentum Unitatis*, but a centre of unity"—[4] a centre, not of ecclesiastical, but of Divine provision: "Thou art Peter; and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give to thee the keys"—symbol of a supreme authority. This supreme grace of "Christ's Unity" has, then, been Divinely bestowed and unceasingly preserved in His Church in such wise as to merit indeed the term sacramental. Its outward and visible sign, means, channel is the See of Peter: *Ubi Petrus, ibi Ecclesia.* There can be no "part" of

[4] Newman, *Development*, pp. 154-5.

the Church outside the jurisdiction of Peter's successor. Submission to, and communion with this See assures participation in this essentially Divine perfection of indivisible unity—"in the unity of the Spirit".

The Visible Unity of the Catholic Church thus sacramentally conferred, attached to, insured by Peter's See, cannot, then, be broken. Never can Christ's Church become "a kingdom divided against itself," never three communions. It ever of its very essence remains a kingdom visibly "at unity with itself" in government and organization—*visibly one communion.*

H. P. RUSSELL.

Rugby, England.

CHURCH RECONSTRUCTION UNDER BISHOP ENGLAND.

1822-1842.

AFTER repeated requests from Archbishop Maréchal, the Holy See created the Diocese of Charleston, on 12 July, 1820, and appointed Father John England, then parish priest of Bandon, in the Diocese of Cork, Ireland, Bishop of the new see. Unfortunately, the equanimity of the Baltimore metropolitan was disturbed by the fact that Richmond had also been made an episcopal see, with Bishop Patrick Kelly as its first incumbent. Geographical knowledge of the United States was not very extensive at the time among the officials of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide; for, if we are to believe Father William Taylor, of Boston, who was then in Rome, there was serious difficulty in persuading Cardinal Fontana, the Prefect, from establishing the city of Hartford, Conn., as the episcopal See of the Diocese of Virginia. Maréchal never forgot this act of Fontana, and those who are familiar with the extraordinary scene which occurred when Bishop Kelly presented himself at Baltimore, can well understand how Dr. England came in for a share of Maréchal's misgivings during the rest of that prelate's lifetime. Bishop England knew very little about America at the time of his consecration. There had been an intimate, though wary, correspondence between the metropolitans of Baltimore and Dublin in Dr. Carroll's time, but there was little affection between Archbishop Troy of Dublin and the young

clergyman of Cork who had so brilliantly disagreed with him on the tortuous question of the Veto. Carroll's letters in the Dublin archives would have furnished Dr. England with a rough estimate of the condition of his diocese, since the malcontents who had thrown it into confusion came to America with Dr. Troy's letters of recommendation. Dr. England's friend, Bishop Moylan of Cork, who had ordained him, was the brother to General Stephen Moylan, Washington's aide-de-camp and Commissary-General of the Continental Army; but General Moylan had died nearly a decade before. The newly-consecrated prelate came, therefore, to his diocese with little information except that given him by one of the two priests who had blocked Carroll, Neale, and Maréchal in the performance of their duty to the Church there. This, strange to say, was not of England's own choosing, but in obedience to Propaganda Fide which had suggested his being guided by the clergyman in question.

The condition of the Church in his diocese, which included the two Carolinas and Georgia, was a deplorable one. The Jesuits, Fathers Benedict Fenwick and Wallace, had succeeded in bringing some semblance of order into the misrule created by restless spirits like Simon Felix Gallagher and Robert Browne. The outstanding fact of Dr. England's coming to Charleston is that it prevented the scheme these two men had organized for the establishment of a Jansenist bishopric of the Southland, directly subject to the Archbishop of Utrecht. How little Bishop England knew of the colossal task before him is evident in his letter from Bandon, 13 July, 1820, to the "Principal Roman Catholic Clergyman at Charleston", asking for an advance of three hundred pounds and sufficient funds for the expenses of his voyage across the Atlantic. It would have been impossible at the time to have raised that amount by a national collection. Poor Fenwick, who was to succeed Bishop Cheverus at Boston a few years later, simply gasped at the request and passed the letter on to Maréchal, with whom undoubtedly it did harm to Dr. England. The request, however, was characteristic of the man; from the date of his arrival at Charleston (31 December, 1820) until his death twenty-two years later, the *vescovo a vapore*, as the Roman officials learned to call England, knew no rest, recognized no obstacle in per-

fecting the task given to him by the Holy See, and never failed on any one single occasion to insist with the laity on the necessity of support for all diocesan works. Sad as was the disciplinary and financial condition of the diocese, there is seldom a weary note in Dr. England's correspondence with the Holy See or with his fellow-bishops in the United States. Schism, disorder, and worse, had reigned in the larger centres of his diocese for years before his arrival, and he was obliged to cope with problems seldom paralleled in the Church of God in this country. *Forma gregis, forma pastoris*; and one has not the heart to write openly of the clergy of the Southland at that time. Between adherence to trusteeism, Freemasonry and independence of spiritual rule, the laity were a broken reed, and it hardly added to his contentment to find one of their leaders bearing his own name—Alexander England.

In a long report on the state of the Church in the Southland, as he had found it during a visitation that occupied the first four months of his residence there, Bishop England told Cardinal Fontana of the progress made up to that date (4 April, 1821). On 21 January, 1821, he had published his first Pastoral to the faithful of his flock, placing the status of their mutual relationship in clear, unmistakable language. The germ of all his future work can easily be seen in this short document—his duty it was to keep ever before their minds their obligations as Catholics and as citizens of the Republic. "We ourself", he wrote, "have for a long time admired the excellence of your Constitution, and been desirous to behold your eagle grow in strength and beauty as his years increased—whether he rested in majesty upon the bases of the wisdom, the moderation, and the fortitude of your government, or, lifting himself on the pinions of your prosperity, and surrounded with the halo of your multiplying stars, fixed his steady eye upon that sun of rational freedom, which culminates for you, as it departs from the nations of the East." Of John England's love for America no one ever doubted in his own time or since; and in the score of years he presided over the Church of Charleston, his love and admiration for the principles of American freedom became deeper and surer. In this first visitation he found that out of a population of about two million, eight hundred thousand of which were slaves, there were

five thousand Catholics faithful to the Church. Their poverty, their lack of educational facilities for their children, and their scattered condition sent him back to Charleston with the determination to create an organization which would bring courage and assistance to the priests and people who looked to him to save them from what was apparently spiritual bankruptcy. Dr. England could not think in terms of small horizons. No man ever graced the American episcopate with less of the *esprit-du-clocher* rule, the narrowness of which had weakened the Church in all parts of the United States. He looked first, as he felt he had a right to, to his brethren in the episcopate. His letters to Maréchal and to the other bishops are an eloquent plea to them to come together from the far ends of the country and to legislate for the betterment of the Church as a corporate unity within the nation. He believed that the Holy See would gladly place at the disposal of the bishops monetary assistance in their great struggle for the Faith here. He saw difficulties within his own jurisdiction that were similar, if not identical, to difficulties common to the other dioceses. What he desiderated most at the time was a Synod for the Province of Baltimore, then coterminous with the Republic. The disciplinary agreement between the Bishops in 1810 was but a makeshift, since they were to meet in 1812 for a Provincial Council. But the war of 1812 had interfered with the project, and after peace had been signed, Cheverus seems to have set his mind against the tiresome journey to Baltimore. Archbishop Carroll died without convoking the Synod; his successor, Archbishop Neale, was incapacitated in health, and Maréchal had been Archbishop for three years when Dr. England reached Charleston. But letter after letter to Maréchal on the necessity of a Synod bears on its margin the single word *negative*.

Writing to his old antagonist, Archbishop Troy, of Dublin, on 9 October, 1821, England says:

> I wish we were nearer to Rome than we are, or that the state of our miserable and distracted Church was better known there. I know not how I ought to act. I see such a complete want of system, co-operation, zeal, ability, and knowledge in most places, and the infatuation of a few and the crimes of others spreading ruin widely through the States. The Presbyterians, Episcopalians, Methodists, Baptists, and a thousand other denominations are far beyond the

Catholics in point of numbers, talent, appearance, and progress; and this not the fault of the Catholic Laity, but of the Clergy, and in some instances of a Bishop. The Archbishop [Maréchal] refused to call a Synod. Schism is making head under his eyes, and he will not interfere.

This letter gives us a hint of a rather delicate problem in any estimate of Maréchal's career as Metropolitan of the Church in the United States (1817-28). These were grave years in the political history of the young Republic which had just won the second war of Independence with England and was then if ever imbued with the strongest appreciation of the value of neutrality in all foreign affairs. In spite of all the problems of Catholic discipline and the necessity of a uniform code of action, Dr. England found no response in the hearts of his fellow-bishops. Dr. Kenrick had been trained in a school where the canonical procedure of the Church was held in high regard. Despite his youth, he had considerable influence at Rome and with the American Episcopate; but he was from Dublin and John England was from Cork. Dr. Cheverus was then growing tired of his popularity with the Puritan society leaders of Boston and preparing to seek higher honors in his native land. New York had John Dubois as Bishop. The Church in Philadelphia was being maladministered by Henry Conwell; and Bardstown, which ruled the Church in the Middle West, was more than ever out of touch with national Catholic affairs in the person of the saintly Benedict Joseph Flaget. The Dominican, Edward Dominic Fenwick, was then fighting the Church's battle in Ohio against odds that were almost insuperable. These leaders were growing old in the service of Christ, and except infrequently when two of them would meet, there was no opportunity, save by correspondence, to discuss Church conditions in the nation. Over the American Church hovered the spirit of unrest, of insubordination, of disunited progress. As Dr. England viewed the situation, there was but one hope—the convocation of a national Council in which the seven Bishops of the country might assemble to settle upon a united method of discipline for the clergy and laity and to suggest ways and means for the support of the Church.

It is not within the scope of this paper to discuss the reasons, political and otherwise, that prevailed with Archbishop

Maréchal to keep his suffragans apart. That he was stubborn in his refusal to hold a Council or Synod is a matter of history. It was not till after his death (28 June, 1828), and then reluctantly, that the insistence of the Holy See induced Archbishop Whitfield to call the First Provincial Council of 1829. In one of his letters to Maréchal (15 January, 1823), Bishop England wrote:

> The subject [Trusteeism] is one of the utmost importance to the Church of America, and one *which never will be settled by correspondence.* From the moment of my arrival, I have anxiously desired to meet my elder brethren upon the subject. But you, Most Rev. Sir, appear to me so decidedly unwilling to assemble a Synod, that I now begin to despair of any permanent good being done. We are fighting in detached squads, and our enemy is systematically in order. We must inevitably be defeated. I shall add no more on this, to me, painful subject. You do not, you cannot from mere letters, know the state of my diocese. I do not know that of yours.

Clogged and thwarted—to use his own phrase—in securing a uniform method of Catholic action and welfare throughout the American Church, Dr. England decided to create a compact system for his own diocese.

> Finding myself alone in this state of perplexity [he wrote to Maréchal], and [with] no prospect of having this common aid, which the custom of all ages provided for our mutual wants, I was driven to think and to act for myself, though upon my coming hither I had resolved to act as little as possible from my own judgment, but as much as possible in union with the Archbishop and my other brethren. But perceiving the inutility of expecting that I can have the aid of their lights in the only way that I conceive it would be beneficial, I have determined to draw up a code for my own Diocese.

Thus came into existence what may be called America's first Catholic Welfare Council. Dr. England called it, however, a Convention, no doubt realizing the uncertainty of the word Council in other languages than English. The declaration that he had set about organizing his own diocese upon canonical lines was taken as a reflection upon the state of the Church in the archdiocese. "You are the only bishop requiring this" Maréchal told him; "why do you think yourself wiser than the other Bishops?" England had determined, however, to

put his own house in order, in spite of the obvious comparison that would be made. A fuller history of the reception of his Convention would reveal the distrust and opposition the project aroused in the minds of several of the bishops, and he was more than once called upon to defend his plan and methods.

The *Constitution of the Roman Catholic Churches of North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia* was drawn up in the autumn of 1822, and is one of the most remarkable documents in American Catholic history. The preface states in a broad way the general ecclesiastical principle of spiritual authority resident in the bishops of the Church, and places squarely before a laity, accustomed to ignore all such appeals, the paramount duty of Church support under the direction of the bishop and priests of the diocese. The evils that had entered the American Church from the beginning of Carroll's régime (1784) were too well known to need recapitulation, but Dr England stressed one point with masterly emphasis—the close resemblance between citizenship and duty as regarded by the Federal Constitution and by the Catholic Church. The object of the Constitution he had framed was "to lay down those general principles of law and to show their special bearing in the most usual cases; and then upon the mode of raising, vesting and managing Church property, to fix the special manner in which the great principles that are recognized by the Church should be carried into practice". He had consulted with the clergy and the leaders of the laity in the different parts of his vast diocese, larger than all Italy, as he tells Fontana, and the Constitution was adopted by them on 25 September, 1822. A copy was sent to the Holy See, and "no objection having been received from that quarter, and its provisions having been more maturely examined, and tested by some experience", it was finally decided to proceed with the work. The Constitution is divided into seven *tituli* or titles: on doctrine; ecclesiastical government; Church property; conditions of membership in the vestry or trusteeship of the parish or district; the method of holding a Convention; the mode of assembling and of procedure in the meeting; and the rule on amendments.

Fortunately, there is preserved sufficient documentary material to show how faultlessly the Constitution governed the diocese during the rest of Dr. England's episcopate. The

entire diocese was divided into three Conventions or Districts, or Welfare Councils, each distinct and independent: the Convention of North Carolina, that of South Carolina, and that of Georgia. Each State was divided into a number of parochial units, made up of definite geographical divisions, and with a definite church as the centre. The parochial units decided upon the delegates to the general District meetings. The clergy of each District were expected to be present; the number of lay-delegates was usually nine. During the years 1823-1839, Dr. England presided over two such Conventions of the District of North Carolina, over nine Conventions of the Georgia District, and over fifteen annual Conventions of the South Carolina District. The success of his plan is evident from *Proceedings* which have been preserved in the *Catholic Miscellany*. In 1839, the division into Conventions of the three Districts was abandoned, and a Convention of the whole diocese was created. Two such general Conventions were held before Dr. England's death in 1842. The mode of procedure was somewhat similar to that in vogue in the annual conferences of the Protestant Episcopal Church to-day. The clerical delegates formed the House of the Clergy with their own president, and the House of the Lay Delegates elected its president for the meeting. Each House met separately to decide upon the questions belonging to its jurisdiction. When the business of both Houses was completed, a general assembly took place with the bishop as chairman. The Convention opened with a solemn Mass, at which it was expected that all the lay delegates would receive Holy Communion. Before the end of the Mass, the presidents of the two Houses read a declaration of faith, and to this the members of both Houses appended their signatures. After the Mass, the two Houses began the work of the meeting. Usually they both met in the same building and the meetings were carried on simultaneously. Neither House had the privilege of adjourning without the bishop's consent, and once the Convention was over, neither House was permitted to reassemble. The powers of the members, both clerical and lay, were restricted. The Convention was not a part of the ecclesiastical government of the diocese, but solely "a body of sage, prudent, and religious counsellors to aid the proper ecclesiastieal governor of the

Church in the discharge of his duty, by their advice and exertions in obtaining and applying the necessary pecuniary means to those purposes which will be most beneficial, and in superintending the several persons who have charge thereof; to see that the money be honestly and beneficially expended". First of all there was created a "General Fund of the Church in this Diocese", toward which every Catholic was to pay the sum of fifty cents quarterly, on the first day of February, May, August and November. The purposes to which this fund was applicable, at the discretion of the Convention, were the following: 1. The erection or improvement of the cathedral, as being the great church of the whole diocese. 2. The aid of students in theology, especially by the erection and support of the seminary, as being absolutely necessary to insure to the diocese a supply and succession of good clergymen. 3. Giving aid to missionaries to preach the Gospel and to administer the Sacraments in remote, poor and neglected parts of the diocese. 4. Giving aid to small or poor congregations or parishes, in the erection of churches, or other works of religion; but this should be by loan rather than by donation. 5. Giving aid to such religious communities, associations, or establishments, as are calculated to promote the interests of religion, by public edification and instruction. 6. Giving aid to such schools as should be established, not merely to teach the human sciences, but also the knowledge of the true faith, and the way to eternal life. 7. The solace and aid of well-conducted destitute widows, or aged and infirm members of the church. 8. The protection, education, and aid of orphans or destitute children of the church. 9. Any other purpose that the principles exhibited in the above enumeration may justly embrace.

The problems brought before different Conventions are singularly enough a foreshadowing of those which have occupied the minds of our prelates in recent years: Catholic education; Seminary training and a native clergy; social welfare work amongst the laboring classes; legislation and defence of Catholic moral principles; Catholic literature; and the Catholic press. As a result of the active coöperation Dr. England aroused in the three Districts, the *Catholic Miscellany*, a weekly periodical which he had founded in 1822, was given

support by subsidies voted at different times when its exchequer was without funds. For the elementary education of the boys and girls of the diocese, he was assisted by the Convention in founding the Sisters of Mercy, whose first hundred years of devotion to the diocese will be rounded out in 1929. The orphans, the sick, and the colored children were also cared for by this community; and in the proceedings of the different Conventions, Dr. England never lost an occasion to praise the welfare services of the Sisters and to solicit aid for their work. For the higher education of young girls, he founded a convent of the Ursuline nuns in 1834, and ten years previous to this he had established the Philosophical and Classical Seminary for collegiate and seminary training. It is worthy of note that whenever possible he always ordained students for major orders during the Convention. The presence of a number of priests lent dignity to the ceremony and gave no small edification to the lay delegates. To support the poor missions of the Southland, he created the St. John the Baptist Society in 1835, and a Catholic Book Society was begun with the same purpose as that of the Catholic Truth Societies in England and America to-day. A comparison between the catalogue of Catholic books published in the *Catholic Miscellany* in 1822 and in 1837 gives evidence of a remarkable success in this field.

Probably, the outstanding feature of the social welfare work attempted by the Conventions was that done among the laboring classes in the diocese, Charleston was an important shipping centre during Dr. England's episcopate, and the city has an interesting history as a focus during the turnpike, canal, steamboat, and railroad eras. Many of those who worked on the canals and railroads were Catholics from Ireland. Dr. England had witnessed many sad results of their ignorance of climate conditions, especially during the outbreaks of the "Stranger's Fever". After several experiments, he founded in 1838 the Brotherhood of St. Marino, as a labor society for all the workingmen of the diocese. "St. Marino was a stonemason", he wrote in the preamble to the constitution of the Brotherhood, "who established a community upon the principles of pure democratic republicanism, strict frugality, healthful temperance and exemplary virtue." The ideas of the Brotherhood were the same as those of the little Italian Re-

public which still bears the saint's name. It was soon an object of pride in Charleston, many non-Catholics gaining admittance into its ranks. It had its own savings-bank, its own physicians; and in times of sickness or plague, the brothers rented sometimes two, sometimes a whole row of houses which they turned into a hospital for the care of their members. Here at the bedside of the sick and dying the Sisters of Mercy would be found, and more than once in England's days, the Mayor and the City Council passed unanimously a vote of thanks to these devoted women.

To read the annual addresses given by Bishop England in these Conventions is to read the intimate history of the Southland. Practically every aspect of Catholic life to-day is touched upon in these excellently prepared papers. They are a retrospect of the year that was passed and a prospect of what was to be done in the year to come. One note can be heard quite clearly above the rest of this harmonious coöperation between the Bishop and his flock—the necessity of rearing the young in the best spirit of American idealism. At the outset of his episcopate he had also determined to employ only those clergymen in the diocese who would join to sound faith, tried virtue and knowledge, "an attachment to our republican institutions, citizens, and if possible, natives of these southern states, who may be found assimilated to the climate, and feel that they are, as it were, a part of the country itself".

The reader will not take it amiss if it be remarked that like all religious works begun in the name of God, Dr. England found his Constitution and Conventions attacked in different parts of the country. The Constitution was printed in 1825, and copies were eagerly sought by friend and enemy. It is evident from the letters of the period that the systematic organization of the Southland was not relished in the North and in the Middle West. In one of Dr. Conwell's letters to Maréchal there is the pathetic appeal of an old man who was fighting a losing battle against misrule, begging the metropolitan to put a stop to the work in Charleston, lest the priests and people of his own diocese should find it worthy of imitation. From Kentucky came an episcopal letter objecting to the definition of faith in the first Title, on Doctrine, and Bishop England was obliged to publish in the *Miscellany* a letter in

explanation of the terms he had used. He always deplored opposition and contention, especially when it arose in the higher circles of the Church in this country, but he never allowed it to stem his enthusiasm or to chill his zeal. He had grown accustomed to the misreading of his motives from the first year of his episcopate, when Maréchal of Baltimore, Curtis of Armagh, and Poynter of London attempted to prevent his edition of the Missal in English. After Maréchal's death (1828), he found himself in direct opposition to Archbishop Whitfield (1828-34) and Eccleston (1834-51) on the question of holding triennial Provincial Councils. His advice prevailed in Rome over the determination of the Archbishops not to convene these national synods, and to him more than to any other ecclesiastic is due the credit for bringing the American Church more in harmony with the Canon Law of the Universal Church.

Dr. England has summed up for us the result of the Conventions in the following paragraph taken from his address before the thirteenth Convention of South Carolina, held in January, 1837:

> My brethren, thirteen years have elapsed since this Constitution has, by our solemn act, after repeated deliberations, become the rule of our proceedings. By its provisions the limits of our several powers and duties are accurately defined; it has prevented discord, it has banished jealousy, it has secured peace, it has produced efforts of coöperation, and established mutual confidence and affection between our several churches, as well as between the bishop and the churches, and by confirming the rights of all, it has insured the support of all. So long as its provisions are exactly and scrupulously observed, it is to be hoped that those blessings will also continue; but if a deviation be once made from its principles, I fear much that we should thereby be thrown into a chaos of uncertainty.

Out of many comments on the Charleston Constitution the following is taken from a letter to Bishop England written by Bishop Rosati, 7 December, 1826:

> I have received the copy of the Constitution of the R. C. Church of South Carolina which you have favoured to send me by the last mail. I am very much obliged to your kindness, and think it my duty to offer you my sincere and hearty thanks for it, as well as to express here how much I have been gratified by the perusal of it.

The wisdom and prudence with which without deviating in the least from the most approved general discipline of the Catholic Church you have framed it in such a manner as to adopt such regulations as will, if carried into execution, secure to your flock the deposit of faith, to the ecclesiastical jurisdiction respect and submission, to the clergy honour and support, and to Religion at large propagation and stability. I congratulate, therefore, your Diocese for all these blessings, and pray Almighty God to preserve to it the pastor to whom, after God, it owes them.

One cannot help wondering what might have been the story of the American Church, if, instead of one in whose apostolic zeal and devotion he was deceived, Bishop England had succeeded in having Paul Cullen appointed as his coadjutor in 1834. The future Cardinal was then Rector of the Irish College in Rome, and had the highest admiration for Dr. England, but both Gregory XVI and Pius IX who were his intimate friends, saw greater things in store for the man who was to be the first of all Irish bishops to be raised to the cardinalitial dignity. How near England himself came to the same dignity will never be known, though there is constantly in the correspondence of the day (1834-36) the rumor that the Holy See had decided to make him a Cardinal as a reward for his work as Apostolic Delegate to the much-harassed Island of Haiti.

PETER GUILDAY.

Catholic University of America.

THE UNIAT ARMENIAN CHURCH.

APPEAL is again and again being made to the hierarchy and clergy, collectively and singly, on behalf of the Armenian Catholics, that is to say, the Uniats who belong to the fold of Rome and St. Peter. Meanwhile reports are also being circulated that, as a result of the frequent wholesale massacres by the Turkish Moslems, the Christians of Armenia have been reduced to an inconsiderable contingent, without ecclesiastical or national organization; and that the cry for help is a mere pretence intended to turn the flow of philanthropic sentiment in America toward the mongrel forces that make against Turkish ascendancy and against Russian designs.

The answer to this misrepresentation is found in the action of the late Sovereign Pontiff shortly before his death, when in an Allocution to the Cardinals in Consistory (10 March, 1919) he stated that he had repeatedly appealed to the Ottoman Empire on behalf of the Armenians, not only as a Christian people under Moslem power, but as individuals condemned to death on account of their religious conviction falsely interpreted as political opposition. Benedict XV had emphatically requested the Turkish Government to stop the massacres and executions in Armenia. Moreover the Holy Father had taken definite steps for the protection of the Armenian refugees and had fostered the establishing of orphanages under Christian management in the very city of Constantinople.

In view of these facts, and in order to form a correct estimate of the condition of the Armenian Church to-day, in its development during the centuries since its foundation, the readers of the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, especially those who come into contact with the Armenian immigrants and their Uniat clergy, will be served by a brief review of the subject.

I.

Enclosed between the Caspian, the Mediterranean and the Black Seas, between the Taurus and Caucasus mountains, between Persia, Kurdistan, Mesopotamia, Syria and Anatolia, lies a land covering about 500,000 square miles, which for nearly two thousand years has been the centre of struggling Christianity. It has been described as a land of roses and singing, although its chief prerogative is that for centuries it has stood in the history of the world as the symbol of martyrdom, the land synonymous with systematic oppression and persecution, torture and death, murder and rapine, burning and desolation, atrocities and fanaticism on the part of its invaders and conquerors. It is the ancient kingdom mentioned in Genesis under the name of Ararat, known to the Assyrians and Greeks as Urartu and Chaldia, to the Persians as Armina, whilst the natives—*Haikh*—called it Haiastan, the modern Armenia. The main area is a table-land divided by lofty ranges of magnificent mountains, rising from 6,000 to 12,000 feet in height and reaching a peak of 17,000 feet in the holy Mount Ararat. These are intersected by wild gorges offering

a grand and romantic scenery, amidst fertile and beautiful valleys with wide expanses of arable land and grassy tracts, watered by the great lakes of Van and Urmia, and by mighty rivers, the Tigris and Euphrates, the Aras and Choruk, and others. The rich soil produces wheat and rice, vines and various kinds of fruit, cereals and cotton; the broad pasture-lands support large flocks of sheep and goats, herds of cattle, horses and mules, whilst the mountain region abounds in mineral wealth of gold and silver, copper and iron, and in mineral springs. No wonder that its people have been loyal to the soil and its history through centuries of forced or voluntary exile, and sing: "Still thy ruins are Eden to me, my queen, my mother, my love, my life, my beloved Armenia".

If, according to an Eastern proverb, "it takes two Jews to cheat a Greek and four Greeks to cheat an Armenian," the Armenians must be a brilliant race. In agricultural districts, poor and unambitious, they are industrious, good farmers and cultivators of the soil, frugal and hospitable. The townspeople are skilled artisans, remarkable for their industry, quick intelligence, and aptitude for business; as emigrants to foreign lands they take advantage of every opportunity to improve their position and they have distinguished themselves in the fields of diplomacy and military life, of commerce and industry, as money-lenders and bankers as well as in art and literature. But whether politicians or diplomats, generals or financiers, merchants or farmers, they are all strongly attached to the old manners and customs of their native land, and their remarkable tenacity and sturdiness of character have enabled them to preserve their nationality. Withal there is in them a self-seeking greediness, a love of vanity and intrigue, a certain domestic jealousy and a lack of stability which have had an unfortunate influence on their history and destiny as a people and its national independence. This they have enjoyed but for brief intervals owing to the peculiar position of the country, its physical features and the isolation of the valleys. Forming, as it were, an open doorway between East and West through the pathways connecting the Iranian plateau with the fertile lands and the protected harbors of Asia Minor, Armenia has been overrun in turn by Assyrians and Babylonians, Medes and Persians, Romans and Greeks, Arabs and Turks, Mongols and

Tartars, Seljuks and Kurds, from the days of Darius Hystaspis and Xyaxerxes (500 B. C.) to the present time. At the end of these periods the riches of Armenia have been exploited and its territory divided among Persia, Turkey, and Russia. Thus Armenia, although still a nation, is debarred from ruling its own territory, since even before the war 1,845,000 of its inhabitants were subject to Turkey, 1,000,000 or more to Russia, 150,000 to Persia, whilst 250,000 and more were scattered over Asia, Europe, America, the East Indies, and other countries. These numbers have been reduced by perhaps over a million during and since the war.

Yet the Armenians, standing between the East and the West, on the confines of barbarism and civilization, with the sword in one hand to fight the Persians, Arabs, Seljuks, Turks and Kurds, were among the first to carry the torch of the Christian faith and culture to enlighten the Eastern peoples.

II.

For the supposed correspondence between King Abgar and our Lord and for the introduction of Christianity into Armenia by the Apostles, Sts. Bartholomew and Thaddeus, Simon and Jude, there exists no historical foundation, nor are there any trustworthy records; both are legends and betray a Syrian or a Greek rather than an Armenian origin. That Christianity was known there in the middle of the third century is attested by Tertullian and Dionysius of Alexandria (248—65) and his correspondence with an Armenian, Meruzan. The national apostle of Armenia is St. Gregory the Illuminator (*Lussavoritsh*), who at the time of the Persian invasion fled from Armenia (238) and was instructed and baptized in Cæsarea in Cappadocia. On his return to Armenia in 261 he proceeded against the Persian fire-worshipers, baptized King Trdat or Tiridates II (282—317) and several princes and a large number of people. Gregory (+ 325) himself was chosen and proclaimed Catholicos, was consecrated by Leontius, Bishop of Cæsarea (302); and Christianity under the protection of the king began its triumphal march across Armenia. Idolatry was abolished, the pagan temples were replaced by Christian churches at Ashtishat, Bagavan and Valarashapat or Etshmiadzin, and the celebration of the Christian mysteries was sub-

stituted for the pagan and national festivals. The sons of some of the former pagan priests were educated, ordained priests and consecrated bishops, whilst the property of the former temples was allocated to them for ecclesiastical purposes and for the maintenance of the priests or Armenian missionaries, who went forth among the neighboring nations to carry the message of the Gospel to the Afghans, the Parthians, and Persians.

The Armenian Church with its centre at Ashtishat was under the metropolitan of Cæsarea from 302 to 372 and as such was part of the Catholic Church, as the Armenians, like all Eastern Churches, considered the Bishop of Rome the successor of St. Peter, the doorkeeper and the keybearer of heaven. When in 312 Emperor Maximinus declared war against Armenia to force her back into paganism, the Armenians courageously resisted and defeated him; and when Arianism sought to ensnare them into the net of heresy they strongly opposed by sending Bishop Aristakes to represent them at the Council of Nicaea (325). Internal dissensions stayed the progress of Christianity for a time as the pagan successors of Tiridates—Chosrow, Arsak and Pap (317—74)—persecuted the Christians, and the Persians under King Sapor once more invaded the land. But the Catholicos Nerses, supported by St. Basil, metropolitan of Cæsarea, summoned his bishops to the first national synod held at Ashtishat (365) and laid down new rules regulating the laws of ecclesiastical discipline, fasting, and marriage. He likewise opened hospitals and hospices, estabished monasteries and schools, improved the pitiable situation of the poor, encouraged art and literature, the study of Greek and Syriac (the liturgical languages then in use in Armenia) and thus paved the way for the systematic evangelization of the country. But by enforcing the canons of Ashtishat, Nerses greatly aroused the spirit of national independence so conspicuous in both the political and ecclesiastical life of the Armenian nation, that King Pap had him deposed and murdered. He then appointed an Anti-Catholicos, withdrew the state endowments, suppressed the monasteries, reintroduced pagan idolatry and finally separated the Armenian Church from the jurisdiction of Cæsarea and thus made her autonomous in 384 with Valarashapat (Edzmiazim) as its

spiritual centre. When the Roman-Greeks and Persians divided Armenia among themselves (379), the latter tried once more to enforce upon Christian Armenia the pagan tenets of Zoroasterism or Mazdaism, but the danger was averted by two men who stand out conspicuously in the history of the Armenian Church, the Catholicos Shack or Isaac (+ 439) and the monk Mesrob (+ 441), who created a written Armenian language for Christian and profane literature. Young Armenian students were sent to seats of learning to obtain copies of the Scriptures and the Fathers which were translated into Armenian. This first translation of the Bible is so conspicuous by its accuracy that it has been called "the Queen of all Versions"; and so true is it to the original that, "if the originals of all Hebrew and Greek Bibles were lost to-day, this ancient Armenian Bible would serve as a text for a new translation into any language".

Among these translations were also the works of Theodoret of Mopsuestia and of Diodorus of Tarsus, which were filled with heretical ideas of Nestorius and were intended to be disseminated throughout Armenia. But her spiritual rulers were forewarned against the errors and they strongly opposed Nestorianism by accepting the Council of Ephesus (431), but only to fall an easy prey to Monophysism by rejecting the Council of Chalcedon (451). Personally prevented from taking part in the latter, (though ten Armenian bishops signed its acts) where the heretical doctrines of Eutyches and Dioscorus were condemned, owing to the unsettled state of political affairs through the invasion of the Persians under Jesdejerd II, the Armenian bishops assembled in 491 at Valarashapat and at Dwin (505—06) and agreed with their Catholicos Papken (490—515) to accept the Henotikon of Emperor Zeno and to reject and to condemn the canons of Chalcedon. This decision was endorsed by the two synods of Dwin (525) and Feyin (527) and finally at Dwin on 11 July, 552, *the red letter day of the Independent National Church of Armenia,* and the beginning of her new era and her separation both by schism and heresy from the undivided Universal Church under their Patriarch Nerses II.

Abortive attempts to unite the Armenian Church with the Byzantine were made by Emperor Justin II (565—78) and

Catholicos John, by Maruice (582—602), and Catholicos Moses I, by Heraclius (610—14), and Catholicos Esdras. A temporary reunion was effected at the synod of Theodosiopolis (Karin-Erzerum) in 633, but was dissolved again by that of Dwin in 645. New efforts were made by Photius and Catholicos Zachary, by Emperor Manuel Comnenus (1170—79) and Catholicos Nerses IV, etc.; but the leaders of the Armenian Church returned as an answer to all these appeals the rejection and condemnation of Chalcedon and neither promises nor threats, neither persecutions nor political intrigues could prevail over the Armenian spirit of national and ecclesiastical independence.

The repeated invasions of the Arabs from 651 onward, who brought Armenia under the yoke of the Caliphas of Damascus (till 750) and of Bagdad (750—1258) proved disastrous to Christianity in Armenia and its development, on account of the people's isolation both from the Eastern and the Western Church. The devastating onslaughts of the Seljuks in the middle of the eleventh century forced many of the Armenians who were unwilling to accept the tenets of Islam, to leave their home and seek refuge in the Taurus mountains, in Cilicia, Egypt, Greece, and Hungary. Here they came into contact with the Crusaders, whose arrival was hailed by these refugees as the harbingers of victory of the Cross over the Crescent. Many of the Armenians joined the Crusaders against their common foe, Turks and Greeks, and were rewarded by the grant of the kingdom of Cilicia or Lesser Armenia which lasted till the year 1375. In 1198 the Armenian Prince Levon (Leo) II (1185—1219) was proclaimed king and the crown was sent to him by Pope Celestine III and Emperor Henry VI. The last king, Levon VI, sought refuge in France, where he died in 1393 and found his last resting-place in the chapel of St. Denis.

There has always been a small number of Uniats in Armenia who had remained faithful ever since they had commenced their friendship with Rome at a synod held there in 649. This was resumed by Popes Nicholas I (866) and Gregory VII, with Catholicos Gregory II Wkajaser (1080) and Gregory III who in 1143 attended a council in Jerusalem. Two years later Armenian delegates arrived at Viterbo to make their

submission to Rome, which act was renewed in 1203 and again at the Council of Lyons in 1274. The fear of the Seljuks once more brought them in closer touch with Rome, as many Armenians settled in Italy. Thereupon Franciscan missionaries were sent to Armenia (1284) and later on Dominicans. King Hethun in union with Catholicos Nicholas IV (1293—1307) had tried to bring about a national union with Rome and at his failure resigned the throne and joined the Franciscan Order. Yet in spite of repeated opposition against Rome, four archbishops and twenty bishops of the schismatical Armenian Church assembled at Sis under the presidency of Catholicos Constantine in 1307, submitted to Rome and renewed it at Adana in 1316. To strengthen this union Pope John XXII (1316—34) at the request of King Ochin sent some Dominican friars to Armenia and appointed Fra Bartholomew of Bologna Bishop of Maragha in 1318. He founded a large Dominican convent, won many of the Armenian clergy, especially John of Kherni, with whose help he founded a branch of the Dominican Order in Armenia known as *Unitores or Uniters of Gregory the Illuminator* 1328. Bartholomew died as Archbishop of Nachitshewan on 15 August, 1333. His successors tried to Latinize the Armenians, by substituting the Latin for the Armenian Rite and by doubting the validity of their sacraments, thus greatly interfering with the progress and losing their influence among the people. Yet Popes Clement VI, Innocent IV, Urban V, etc., renewed their efforts to restore peace and unity through Constantine IV and Levon VI, the Catholic kings of Lesser Armenia.

When Armenia fell partly into the hands of the Sultan of Egypt, and partly into those of Persia and Turkey, the hordes of Tamevlan since 1375 began to ravage it far and wide. Under the Turkish yoke all energy and life seem to have been crushed out of the Armenian people, as they became the victims of the cruelest oppression.

III.

But the Roman Pontiffs, Eugenius IV, Paul III, Alexander VII, and their successors did not forget the Armenians at home or in their exile in Poland, Galicia, Cyprus, Greece, Egypt, France, or Italy, where they had fled in order to escape apostacy

or slavery, torture or death. In 1433 Pope Eugenius IV sent several Franciscans to prepare a Union, and Armenian delegates arrived at the Council of Florence, where they signed the Union on 22 November, 1439, accepted the "Filioque" and the Chalcedon, while the bishops were allowed full jurisdiction over their Armenian subjects and permission to follow their peculiar rites and customs. To strengthen the faithful Armenians Pius V handed over to them the Church of Maria Egyptiaca in Rome; Gregory XIII founded the Armenian College (1584) for the training of an Armenian Uniat clergy, and Urban VIII gave them scholarships in the Propaganda College. About this time the Franciscans and Dominicans working in Armenia were strengthened by the arrival of Augustinians, Theatines, and Jesuits, and were supported by two Armenian Religious Orders which came into existence: i. e. the *Antonines* and the *Mechitarists* and by a Union of secular priests (*United Aleppians*). The latter was founded in 1721 by Abraham Ardzivian (since 1710 Catholic Armenian Bishop of Aleppo), at El Kurein in the Lebanon. In 1740 the Uniat Armenians elected him as Patriarch of Sis and Pope Benedict XIV approved him as Abraham Peter I, Patriarch of Cilicia (1742). As, however, the Monophysites opposed him, he transferred his seat from Sis to his convent in the Lebanon, Bzommar or El Kurein Kesrawan, where all his successors resided to the time of Anthony Peter IX Hassun, 1867.

The Armenian Antonines were founded toward the end of the seventeenth century by Abraham Atar Poresiph in the Lebanon with the object of promoting the Union of Armenia with Rome, and were approved of by Pope Clement XIII. Though few in number, they carry on their work in our own days supported by about twenty convents of Sisters of St. Anthony.

Of greater importance for the religious life, art, science and literature in the Uniat Church of Armenia is the Congregation of the Mechitarists, the "Benedictines of the East", founded by Peter Mechitar Manuk (1676—1749). Born at Sebaste in Asia Minor in 1676, he entered an Armenian convent at Erzerum (1691) and was ordained priest in 1696. Witnessing the work and the beneficent influence of the Catholic Church, and dismayed by the disunion of the Armenian Mono-

physites and the division of Edzmiazin into five rival patriarchates (Edzmiazin, Constantinople, Jerusalem, Sis and Agathmar), he was received into the Catholic Church, and settled at Constantinople, where he opened a missionary school for Armenians under the protection of the French Consul (1702). This was transferred to Modon on the Venetian peninsula of Morea, where in 1703 he started community life based on the rule of St. Benedict. Pope Clement XI approved the constitutions in 1711 and appointed Mechitar as the first Abbot. In 1717 he obtained from Venice the island of S. Lazaro, where many of the most influential of his countrymen joined him. The whole Armenian nation is deeply indebted to this Congregation, whose members have devoted themselves to the spread of Armenian literature and education by their schools and convents and by numerous works of theology, history, science which issued from their printing presses in Venice and Vienna, and by the work of the Apostolate which they exercise in all parts of Asia Minor and Turkey.

To unite and keep the Uniat Armenians in closer touch with each other and to centralize them, Pope Benedict XIV appointed in 1742 Bishop Abraham Ardzivian of Aleppo as Patriarch of Cilicia and Lesser Armenia and as spiritual head of all Uniats except those in Constantinople, who were under the jurisdiction of a Vicar Apostolic. In civil and political matters, however, all the Uniats were subject to the schismatical Patriarch of Constantinople. Greatly enraged by this step of the Pope, the latter denounced the Uniats to the Sultan and accused them of all kinds of crimes. Regular persecutions were waged against them both by the schismatics and the Sublime Port. These reached their climax in 1828. Sultan Mohammed II expelled all the Uniats who did not join the Monophysites or did not turn Mohammedan, and confiscated their property. But by the intervention of the French Delegate, M. Guilleminot, this edict was revoked two years later. The Port now acknowledged the Armenian Uniats politically and legally as a religious community or *Millet*, and gave them their own civil Patriarch in the person of Gregory Enkserdian (1830), a Mechitarist priest, whilst Pope Pius VIII erected an Armenian Catholic Archbishopric at Constantinople on 6 July, 1830 and appointed Mgr. Nuridjian (+ 1838) as

Primate with spiritual jurisdiction over all Uniat Armenians except those in Cilicia and Lesser Armenia. Thus freed from the fetters of the schismatical patriarch and possessing full religious and civil liberty, the Uniats rallied. But the division of civil and religious jurisdictions led to many misconceptions and misunderstandings. Efforts were made by Primate Paul Marush (1838—46) to unite them both in one person. Paul Hassun was appointed his coadjutor *cum jure successionis* in 1842, was made civil Patriarch in 1845, and on the death of Mgr. Marush in 1846 succeeded as Primate. The dignity of both civil and spiritual jurisdictions of Primate and Patriarch were permanently united in 1866, when Mgr. Hassun by unanimous vote of the Armenian Bishops of Cilicia and Lesser Armenia was elected Patriarch of the Armenians, 14 September, 1866. Pope Pius IX confirmed this election of Hassun as Anthony Peter IX, 12 July, 1867, under the title of *Patriarch Ciliciae-Armenorum*, with his residence at Constantinople.

In order to prevent any further interference and undue pressure in the election of the Patriarch and the Bishops of the Uniat Armenians, Pius IX also issued a Bull *Reversurus*, 12 July, 1867, by which the elections were regulated; these were accepted by the Sublime Port. But some of the bishops and lay people protested against these rules and against Mgr. Hassun as having betrayed the Armenian nation. He, however, refused to have them altered. Mgr. Valerga, then Papal Delegate in Jerusalem, was able to prevent a schism. But no sooner had Mgr. Hassun left Constantinople to go to the Vatican Council than the cloud burst again. Mgr. Bahdiarian, Archbishop of Diarbekir, Bishops Gasparian of Cyprus and Kalybian of Amasia, placed themselves at the head of the anti-Hassunite party, won over some of the Mechitarists and Antonine monks and thirty-five secular priests with a large contingent of the people and, declaring the election of Hassun null and void, elected Kupelian as civil and Bahdiarian as spiritual Patriarch, and after the latter's refusal, Gasparian. The Sublime Port officially recognized these and expelled Hassun; the Uniats, however, refused to acknowledge the schismatical party. Pope Pius IX in letters of 20 May, 1870 and 11 March, 1871 sought to establish peace, after the leaders had been excommunicated on 3 April, 1870. Hassun was

allowed to return to Constantinople in 1877; Kupelian asked his forgiveness and made his submission to Leo XIII on 18 April, 1879, and was followed by Gasparian on 26 November, 1880, and the rest in course of time. In reward for his loyalty and fidelity, Leo XIII on 13 December, 1880, created Mgr. Hassun Cardinal, the first Oriental raised to the purple since Bessarion in the time of Eugenius IV. Mgr. Hassun died in Rome on 28 February, 1884.

IV.

In 1883, Leo XIII, seeing how much could be done for the Eastern Churches through Armenia, founded a special college for the Armenians in Rome, strengthened the missions in Armenia by sending some Jesuits to open a college (1881) and Christian Brothers to establish primary and secondary schools, and by letters of 25 July, 1888, and 30 November, 1894, solemnly assured the Armenians that their language in the liturgy and their rites, as laid down by Benedict XIV, would be protected. During the pontificates of Leo XIII and Pius X the number of the Armenian Uniats increased and with it that of bishoprics. But the situation of the Catholics was aggravated by the political unrest and revolutions in Erzerum and Adana (1908—09) and by the tension and rivalry between the clergy and the laity, the latter constantly claiming full control and administrative power in purely ecclesiastical matters. A quarrel broke out in 1910 which caused Mgr. Sabbaghian Peter II to resign his post as patriarch. Thereupon the Uniat bishops unanimously elected as his successor Mgr. Boghos Terzian (23 April, 1910), who since 1892 had been Bishop of Adana. He took possession of his patriarchal see on 10 July, 1910, as Paul Peter XIII, acknowledged by both clergy and people and confirmed by Pius X on 27 November, 1911. But eight months after the conflict was renewed by the untimely interference of some of the lay people in purely ecclesiastical matters, demanding new and more extensive rights. Thereupon Pius X summoned the patriarch and all the Uniat Armenian bishops to a National Synod in Rome. This supported the patriarch against the aggressive policy of his opponents and decreed the erection of two seminaries at Constantinople and Phanaraki to train native

Armenian priests under the tuition of the Assumptionists. But the national party, supported by the Young Turks, rejected the Roman synod, threatened schism and apostacy and declared Mgr. Terzian deposed. Pope Pius X excommunicated the schismatical party in July, 1912. In the beginning of 1915, however, the Turkish Government acceded to the wishes of the Pope and the Patriarch, and through the influence of Mgr. Dolci peace was again restored to the Armenian Uniats. Benedict XV showed the greatest kindness to the Armenians, irrespective of creed, during their trials of the war and by his letters addressed to the Uniats on 1 May and 1 October, 1917, and in an audience to the Mechitarists on 7 August, 1918 gave evidence of the manifold interest he took in the welfare of the Armenian Church, her rites and her liturgy.

Among the Armenian population (numbering between three or four million previous to the war), some 150,000 (or 192,000) were in union with Rome. They were under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Cilicia (of the Armenians) residing at Constantinople with four Archbishops (Lemburg, Siwas-Tokat, Aleppo, and Mardin), fifteen Bishops and nine Patriarchal Vicars, scattered over 132 parishes, with 322 secular and 73 regular priests, and 159 schools with 12,000 pupils. The Religious Orders were represented by Capuchins, Lazarists, Dominicans, Carmelites, Assumptionists, and Christian Brothers, by Mechitarists and Antonines, by the native sisterhood of the Armenian Sisters of the Immaculate Conception founded by Mgr. Hassun in 1843, and by the Oblate Sisters of the Assumption, St. Joseph of Lyons, etc.

V.

In consequence of the war the anxious question is how much of this Christian work and how many Armenians are still left? "We Armenians," says Mgr. Naslian, "are true martyrs and especially the Catholics among us. I will not exaggerate if I say that the martyrology of the Armenian Church, already rich with martyrs, can add at least 800,000 new heroes to its list. Taking only the Catholics, 8,779 men, 9 bishops, 125 priests and 45 sisters perished. Though the number of our Catholics seems small, it constituted a very important Church

with its fifteen flourishing dioceses, schools and institutions. . . . Twelve of these dioceses were entirely destroyed." [1]

The Uniat Church of Armenia is now under the jurisdiction of Mgr. John Naslian, Apostolic Visitor, who is charged by the Holy Seee with the reorganization of what is still left of that Church. He says: "The Turks, proud of their triumph, sing the victory of the Crescent over the Cross in the East, while they defy the Christian West, which, they say haughtily, is afraid of the Moslem and owes respect to them; and those Powers who had solemnly proclaimed that they were fighting to save the oppressed of the world, now sanction the policy which wants to leave us still under the Turkish yoke, thus approving the extermination of the Christians."

MATERNUS SPITZ, O.S.B.

Erdington Abbey, England.

[1] The number of Armenian Uniats varies in the statistics given by the various authors: i. e. 67–70,000 (*Dictionnaire de Théologie,* 1909); 113,000 (*Atlas Hierarchicus,* 1913); 130,000 (*Orbis Catholicus,* 1918); 150,000 (*Lübeck-Aufhauser,* 1918; 192,500 (*El Siglo de las Misiones,* 1921).

Studies and Conferences.

Questions, the discussion of which is for the information of the general reader of the Department of Studies and Conferences, are answered in the order in which they reach us. The Editor cannot engage to reply to inquiries by private letter.

SOCIALISM AND THE CATHOLIC PULPIT.

A thoughtful consideration of the venomous attacks made by the accredited representatives of Socialism on religion and on the Catholic Church in particular will make it evident to every intelligent Catholic that these men have ideas of the principles and doctrines of the Church which are wholly mistaken and fundamentally wrong. Yet if we consider the unqualified and exaggerated statements made by some pastors of the faithful and the general rules of Christian conduct laid down by them, it would appear that these enemies of all religion are not wholly without justification for the false opinions they have conceived of the Church's purposes.

The subject is well worthy the earnest consideration of pastors of souls. We should take the greatest care to give no ground for misrepresentations of the Church. Just as exaggerated ideas with regard to doctrines of faith, a tendency to credulity or superstition, is a fertile cause of unbelief, so an exaggeration of the Church's counsels, an abject literalism in their application, have led in the past to the spirit of hatred and rebellion. Unfortunately, this seems to be a prime cause of much of the opposition to the Church even in our own enlightened and more reasonable age.

The attitude toward the Church on the part of Socialists of the extreme kind, of thoroughgoing Socialists, those who are fully imbued with the spirit of their leaders, is well known. The founder of present-day Socialism, Karl Marx, puts the whole feeling toward the Church in the few pithy words, "Religion is the opium of the people". Fr. Bernard Vaughan quotes the words of a popular haranguer he once heard addressing a multitude of workingmen, that he would "have none of that clap-trap mountain gospel, which tells you to turn the

other check to the capitalist when he strikes you". Dozens and hundreds of quotations from recognized Socialist authorities might be given, wherein the Church is styled, "The pillar of capitalism", "an enemy of liberty and civilization", "a huge and ghastly parasite on the social body", and the like.

Many of these men, evil-minded as they may be in many respects, are sincere in their belief that the Church is a social evil, an enemy to the progress of the working classes. Let us question ourselves, "Are we doing all in our power to disabuse them of these false ideas? Are we endeavoring wisely to win over the workingman from their baneful influence by presenting to him the true gospel of Christ, by making it clear to him that the Church is and has ever been the workingman's best friend?"

A fundamental and fatal mistake that many of Christ's ministers seem to make is to present a false view of Christ's gospel, to apply to the generality of mankind what Christ meant for the few specially chosen, and in special circumstances, to preach the counsels of perfection as though they were commandments of obligation The Mountain-gospel is primarily a gospel of counsels, and the evangelical counsels are not meant for the generality of mankind. Were all Christians to turn the other cheek when struck, Christ's enemies would ride roughshod over His followers. Christ Himself did not do so before Caiaphas. Were all Christians to submit tamely to all kinds of injustice, to look for the reward of the persecuted in heaven, Christianity would truly be what Marx called it, "The opium of the people". Human progress would be impossible, the poor and helpless, the masses, would be ever ground down under the oppression of the wealthy and the powerful.

Surely this is not what Christ meant. Yet such would be the result were the guidance of some of Christ's preachers to be followed. Saintly souls themselves, following with glad hearts the counsels of Christ, their aim has been to put before all men the ideal after which they themselves are striving, nay, which they are exemplifying in their lives, failing in their short-sightedness to see that in the present condition of human nature, the proposal of such an ideal for universal adoption would defeat its very purpose, since it would not move mankind to emulation and imitation, but would prove the very destruc-

tion of the Christian faith and family. Often in the past have the evil results of such principles been witnessed. A few weaklings have gathered around the priests who have counselled submission and patience under oppression; the vast body of the Catholic faithful has stood aloof and indifferent, and a vigorous and energetic minority of enemies of all religion has ruled the country, in spite of the meetings of protest and representations of the ill-guided flocks.

Our Divine Lord chose to give us in His own life a continued example of the counsels. He chose poverty for His portion, not that He wished all His followers to choose poverty after Him, but because He knew that in the very nature of human society the vast majority of mankind must be poor, and He wished to be a consolation and an encouragement to all, to teach all to be reconciled with their lot, and to save their immortal souls in any state of life to which they might be called. He exercised patience under oppression, though He might have annihilated His persecutors, in order to encourage His followers to bear resignedly the persecutions they could not avert; to choose, in special cases, where there was question of only particular and personal inconvenience, to suffer as He did, that they might become more like to Him.

Yet such conduct He does not wish to be practised universally. When the good of souls and the glory of God demand resistance to injustice, the fight is on between His followers and the forces of tyranny and evil. The Christian on earth is in the Church militant; he should not too soon become a member of the Church suffering. When more good can be gained by resisting evil, a personal preference for the merit to be gained from suffering must be laid aside, and the greater good and merit sought which can be gained by fighting valiantly with a pure intention against the enemies of the reign of Christ.

Let us suppose a follower of Christ, a priest of God, sneered at, insulted, struck in the face. If more good is to be gained by a courageous, manly resistance than by what would too often be accounted a cowardly and contemptible submission, he will boldly face the enemy of religion, and will avail himself of the right of self-defence given him by the natural law. Is the flock entrusted to his charge assailed by the wolves of Satan? He will not preach the counsels, he will not advise submission,

and bid his people gain merit by suffering and look to heaven for their reward and their release from affliction; he will exhort them to stand firm in defence of the right, he will organize them and lead them in the battle against injustice.

God's greater glory should ever be the motive of all the actions of God's priests, and this can often be gained only by insistence on one's just rights, only by the preservation of one's authority and influence. While St. Ignatius was in Rome with his first companions, before the Society of Jesus had been confirmed, he was accused of heresy by an enemy who was exerting great influence over the people by his powerful sermons. False witnesses were brought forward to prove that Ignatius had been publicly condemned as a heretic in Spain. Ignatius did not meekly submit to calumny, much as he might have thereby gained in merit. He faced the storm and demanded an inquiry. He had indeed been tried for heresy in Spain, because of a false understanding of his doctrine on mortal and venial sin, but had been acquitted; and as all four of his Spanish judges happened to be in Rome at the time, the refutation of the charge made against him was an easy process. Not content with this, however, Ignatius went to the Pope at Frascati, and a full and judicial sentence was pronounced in his favor. His accuser escaped from Rome, and not long after apostatized, and became a Lutheran at Geneva.

Not all the shepherds of Christ's flock have had the wisdom of St. Ignatius to fight injustice for the greater glory of God. Too often, misguided counsels of religious perfection have been given the faithful, and it is these principles, falsely applied, which have been taken up and exaggerated by men only too willing to avail themselves of any weapons, however unfair, in the accomplishment of their aims. This is why their eyes are closed to all the efforts of the Church for the good of the laboring classes, to their deliverance through her exertions from the slavery of the Roman times, from the serfdom of the middle ages through her religious guilds, down to the relief brought in the industrial subjection of the present day by her wise legislation, and the leadership of her chief Pastor, the workingman's best friend, the immortal Leo XIII.

Unfortunately, it is not always easy for the Catholic apologist to defend some of the advice which has been given the working

classes in their hour of trouble, to explain away as due to other causes the evils which they attribute in great part to the Church and her ministers. Only a few days ago, I read the following quotation from Rizal, the Filippino patriot, in one of the Manila daily papers: "What is there strange in it—(discouragement in the Filippinos)—when we see the pious but impotent friars of that time trying to free their parishioners from the tyranny of the encomenderos by advising them to stop work in the mines, to abandon their commerce, to break up their looms, pointing out to them heaven for their whole hope, preparing them for death as their only consolation".

These are the impressions which we must labor to undo; these are the charges which we must not allow to be made against the Church in the future. Our duty as pastors of souls is to preach the true gospel of Christ in the spirit in which it was given, not in a pious distorted sense of our own. Our duty is to show how, far from being a foe of the masses, a pillar of capitalism, the Church has down through the ages defended the laborer against oppression. We are to combat the evils of Socialism by the work of the social apostolate, by procuring social reform. While exercising a salutary and restraining influence on violent or illegal action, we should endeavor to acquire when possible a leading voice in the councils of labor unions, and always to encourage, aid and lead in the fight against the injustices of wealth and power. Our duty is to help the laboring classes gain all their just demands for opportunities for self-development and progress in this world, which is the will of God as truly as their eternal happiness in the world to come.

H. J. PARKER, S.J.

Manila, Philippine Islands.

IMPORTANCE OF RURAL PARISHES.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

With no intention of beginning a controversy, I wish to narrate an incident which the subject matter of Father Kelly's paper in the December issue of the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW, "The Importance of Rural Parishes", brings to my memory.

About eight years ago I visited a State penitentiary in order to gather statistics in regard to the kind of education the

Catholic prisoners had received. In the course of a conversation with the warden of the institution, I thought of an article in the REVIEW which stated, if I remember rightly, that the faith of Catholics in the cities would disappear, were it not for the incoming of Catholics from the country. Aware that the prison official could give no information upon this particular phase of Catholic life, I took advantage of the occasion to ask him about the relative morality of city people and country people. The answer was an emphatic, very emphatic, declaration that city people were far better than country people. He gave certain facts, to confirm his assertion. In addition, he called an assistant and asked his views as to the subject of my inquiry. The assistant endorsed, without qualification, the opinion of his chief.

It may be of interest to say that this particular warden has had unusual opportunities to know the make-up of the criminal classes. At various times he has been a policeman, a detective, the superintendent of a municipal House of Correction, a Director of Public Safety in one of America's largest cities and, finally, warden of a State penitentiary. For more than twenty-five years he had been brought into close contact with vice and crime.

I am not prepared to appraise the value of this prison official's opinion. I state it simply as it was expressed. I have no scientific data to prove or disprove what he said as to the relative morality of city and country folks. His views, however, taken in connexion with Father Kelly's article, suggest the following questions:

1. Is it true that city life is a greater menace to the faith and morality of Catholics than country life?
2. Is it true that the Catholic people of rural districts are better than the Catholics of the cities?

Father Kelly, no doubt, would answer both questions in the affirmative. Unless he did so, there would be no reason for his article. If an investigation shows that he is right and that his charges and conclusions are warranted, namely, that city life destroys faith and morality, and that country life protects both, then the methods of the Catholic Church in America call for a readjustment in many respects. The duty

of rural pastors, missioners, teachers, and editors to warn and exhort country people, young and old, who are yielding to the allurements and to the thousand circumstances helping on the perpetual drift to the city, is undeniable. Again, if our present educational system is responsible for our boys and girls abandoning the wholesome environment of country life for the corrupting surroundings of city life, then a change in our educational policy is imperative.

But before we accept as true the indictment against city life and the laudation of country life and before we decide that much of the uncompromising advocacy of learning is merely a fetish, and that the emphasis upon the need, the desirability, and the advantages of education creates a desire for professional and business careers and a distaste for the more menial but less promising future than a rural district could provide, we should be quite sure of the facts in the case.

Who can give these facts?

INQUIRENS.

WHY SHOULD PRIESTS BE POOR?

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

My name figures in a clerical directory, a city directory, and a club that regularly sends me a clear statement of my dues. This latter represents my sole official relationship with a very solemn institution. And so I am made the recipient of the most flattering financial offerings that fall to the lot of man. My contributions to charity are neither heavy nor widely blazoned, but in all modesty I suspect they are in keeping with my purse; although, betimes, I have a slinking thought that there are some of my flock more generous than I. And whilst I do not coddle the thought, but shoo it away, there are some elements of discomfort about it. My conscience is salved by certain sporadic outbursts that take the shape of bonuses, as far as that word can be applied to an unproductive consumer. Here again I am uncomfortably reminded that the word bonus may be hog Latin for a bone, and the association of ideas of throwing one at a dog does not flatter my vanity. But as it takes shape in a party for the little ones in the school, or a surprise for the pampered sisters, I quiet my qualms without the

aid of casuistry. Like every son of Adam I have my own visions, not so much of wealth, as rather of the things I would do were it mine. I must confess I would be vastly more generous with it, than with the little store that I have improvidently laid aside. I have a couple of wealthy parishioners, and, on occasion, I try deftly to work in my day-dreams, as a prod to their rather conservative attitude toward the question of giving. The generosity of my projects are always bounded only by the "million" which some day may come. This is merely smoke screen, because it serves so neatly to turn away any suspicion that I have a little nest-egg set aside. And then recently, came the test of how deeply attached I was, not to the priestly "portion of my inheritance," but to the lure that snares all of us poor human creatures. I was most zealously advocating contributions to a new church, and sustaining my exhortations with the highest supernatural motives. In the calculation I had discreetly overlooked myself. Well, I have had only one tooth pulled, but, I fear, in a worldly way, many sharpened. I took gas for the extraction. So it was painless. Now I dread the pun that is forced upon me. My donation to the new church should be payingless. But honor must be served, and I did a violence to my cursed cupidity. When the lists were published I was the largest donor. And my consolation in a human way was—well, after all, I am the biggest beneficiary of my parish.

I felt very virtuous over it all, and in the hidden recesses of my soul I contrasted myself very favorably with publicans and sinners; yes, and with some pastors whom charity forbade me to name. And the fervor of the reward for such righteousness was prompting "go and sell all and give it to the poor". For had I not already promised to follow Him? Frankness prompts the admission that I had not confidence enough in Providence. But the cicatrix is there shaping something like this: "I hope God will not take me unaware, so that I can dispose of my incumbrance before I go hence." I admit this is a guarded prayer, and even if a little cowardly, is sincere. I always admire the innocence of the good old Catholics who tell you in all simplicity: "Oh Father —— left his people very well off": or the clever phrase of the more worldly wise: "Father —— was an excellent business man. He showed rare

discrimination in his purchase of bonds." Of course, let every spirit praise the Lord, and why should not a priest have a little money? The littler the better, of course. And why should not the relations share in the emoluments as they have in the glory of their priests? Well, I will not answer that question. But, I suppose, as we priests are mostly from the poor, we have an instinctive horror of poverty. Our last thought is to court it. And besides, everyone knows how hateful involuntary poverty is. It is a disease that ought to be banished. And this brings me to some ways of making away with it. To this conclusion I am led in terms that bear down any arguments I can summon.

Why should we priests be poor? Opportunity is always knocking at the door. The blazoning of my name in the publicity agencies I mentioned in the opening sentence brought many of these chances to me. And so I take them up separately, not in the least vouching for them, in fact, disclaiming all virtue for them, to the extent, at least, that I have been so blind to their blandishments that they have never made a cent for me, nor lost one, for that matter. I opened my Christmas mail and the first envelope that came into my hand was a fat and most inviting one. Some Christmas gift perhaps! Truly, and beyond expectation. Here was a chance of a lifetime. It would never be offered again. The directors positively could not afford it. They had taken the trouble to have stock certificates issued that surpassed in beauty Central American dollar bills. My name was skillfully written in by a hand that in the Middle Ages might have gone to copy a beautiful manuscript. Only a hundred shares could be presently allotted me. The shares were now one dollar, but by the time my check would reach the treasurer of the company the New York Stock Exchange would be demanding that the stock would be listed; and the railroads would be taxed to transport all of the oil that the gushers would pour out. I wonder who paid the printing bill!

The trite saying that opportunity knocks but once must have been for a day long past. A special delivery letter at midnight woke me from profound slumber and did not precisely put me in the right frame of mind to make a fortune out of a device that would resurrect the sunken treasures of the ocean.

Imagine the argosies torpedoed during the war! Not the salvage alone, but bullion, gold and silver! A hundred dollars now would be the sure harbinger of a magnificent harvest, whose vastness defied computation. Who pays for the postage?

The potash industry was one of the great sources of revenue for Germany. But away out West, in places where broken troths are the most valuable commodity, the inventive genius of America would vindicate itself by vast chemical works that would give the farmer freedom from foreign potash, and the inventor money to visit foreign shores. The seductiveness of this proposed scheme for the quickest, surest, and safest returns had a sad side to it. It threatened to rob the Bolshevik of the only possession they have, namely figures. And the fear that the visible supply might be exhausted caused me to pause. Why, I ask again, should any priest be poor?

Too much has been said about the poor salaries of priests when so many chances for sudden wealth are thrust on them. It is positively pathetic the number of financial geniuses that are planning and plotting to make us rich. The real danger in all of this is that it will become known, and then the people will turn on us and chide us for our lost opportunities. We are a pampered class. The various publications containing our names are daily bringing to our doors the quickest turnover that any men were ever offered.

And I wonder if the opportunity always knocks in vain.

PULLER.

A PASTORAL CRUSADE THROUGH THE HOLY NAME SOCIETY.

We are all familiar with the thousand and one busy-bee societies and organizations that are working night and day in the non-Catholic religious world to "put over" this or that program, in a great many instances actually capitalizing our apathy and inactivity. What will rouse us as a body from our sleeping sickness? The Oregon outrage certainly should. After all, the security of our Faith is apt to become our peril unless we remember the words of Christ, "Watch and pray". We have the most precious inheritance, but that is all the more reason why we should safeguard it.

It is our duty, moreover, to transform our energy into action that will be expressive of what we want to teach and intelligible to those we wish to reach. It would be altogether wrong to regard every non-Catholic as even a potential enemy. Thank God, Catholic charity and optimism are too big to countenance bigotry in our program, but at least it is the part of wisdom to be ready for the enemy when he appears and equipped to show him why he should be our friend. The conservation of energy and its wise dispensation through organization are too well recognized to need more than a passing mention. With proper leverage a child may move a house against which a giant might hurl his massive strength in vain.

The various societies found in our parishes participate in divine guarantees, every one of them motivated by faith in Christ and His teachings. There is not one of them that could not be made a tower of strength for the cause, not one but could carry the offensive to make His Kingdom come. The usual monthly meeting, the spiritual exercises, the conference, etc. of course are excellent; but it would be far from inconsistent with their meaning and purpose if their energy were translated into some definite concrete action, to be felt outside the rooms in which they meet.

This is strikingly true of the Holy Name Society, the importance of which it would be impossible to overrate in its relationship to the lay apostolate. The opportunities here are golden. I do not mean to say that the Holy Name Society could or should comprise the lay apostolate, but I have no hesitation in saying that it could and should be the regiment to carry the colors. Acquaintance with the Society in a variety of parishes in different dioceses during several years of missionary work has strengthened the writer in his conviction that (1) Catholic men everywhere are keenly interested in the aims and ideals of the Holy Name Society. How could it be otherwise! To begin with, it is a virile society, and it honors the Name of Jesus. Its members regard it as a call to arms from the High Command. They join with the greatest enthusiasm, for their eyes are lit with the vision of Faith, but (2) somehow or other the enthusiasm does not seem to last. A great many fall away from anything like active membership, no matter how hard the moderator may work to prevent it. Of

course there are exceptional cases, but I believe these are explained by exceptional moderators. Everywhere priests are devoted to the Holy Name Societies, strong in every possible way to keep alive the interest that the men manifested at the time of their reception. We are all familiar, for example, with the zealous priest who writes from five hundred to one thousand personal letters or cards every month. Again we know of priests who have rivaled Edison in devising ways and means "to keep them coming". These ways and means range all the way from the special lecture to a smoker, a competitive card party or even a good old-fashioned boxing exhibition. As the same time it is a fact generally admitted that none of these things is sufficient; at the best they are artificial stimuli. More than one good priest has shaken his head and asked, "What's wrong?"

May it not be because the Holy Name men have the romance of the Crusades in their souls? They are looking for a worthwhile outlet for that terriffic energy which their faith in the Holy Name creates. From what I know of Catholic men, and the psychology of their religion, I have always felt that they regard entertainment as a side issue—by no means the correlative of the great driving motive which is their love for the Holy Name. By nature men are military, even in religion. For them the Cross commands a battlefield; the Name of Jesus is the signal to advance. Why not lead them up the hill and show them the forces of ignorance and evil that are arrayed against the Commander for whom they would be glad to die? While thoroughly appreciating the excellent motive that inspires the entertainment idea, I have always considered that it was very much like playing a fiddle beside some huge waterfall while the enormous energy rushed over the dam and was lost.

The Holy Name Society has all the possibilities of a great apostolate. All that is needed is the translation for them of what they believe and love. The organization is ready. The most zealous and devoted men in every parish belong or at least could be induced to join. Tell them the story of the Crusades and then equip them. How? By making every Holy Name Society a class for popular apologetics. If the moderator would use even the simple method of the Question Box,

I will venture to say he would have very little difficulty in bringing men to the meetings. I have never met a Catholic layman who was not intensely interested in hearing a simple explanation of his religion. I am certain that every Catholic layman worthy of the name would be delighted if he could stand on his feet for even five minutes to defend it. From the trenches we got a dough-boy's definition of religion: "Religion means betting your life on the existence of God". For obvious reasons he must have been a Catholic dough-boy. Naturally the Catholic is intensely interested in his Faith and its meaning, for he wants to know the ins and outs of his wager. Again, why would it not be a splendid idea for the moderator to explain in detail the meaning of public questions that affect Catholic interests, such as the Sterling-Towner bill, or the Oregon injustice to Christ and His followers, their fellow Catholics?

It is hardly necessary to point out the corollaries that flow from these premises. Every priest knows well the value of even one well-instructed Catholic layman. It would be impossible to calculate the value of a regiment with such inspiration and the right equipment. In this connexion it might be useful to quote a letter from the Chancellor of the Archdiocese of New York who is also Archdiocesan Director of the Holy Name Society:

> Recently I have given considerable thought and attention to naturalization work here in New York. Our Holy Name men might very well and profitably take up naturalization work among the immigrant population that we have in this great diocese. Another point is this, non-Catholic agencies, churches, etc. in our very city are every day escorting dozens of foreigners to the Naturalization Bureau and assisting them to secure their papers. It is but natural that these foreigners conceive the idea that they are indebted to these Protestant organizations for the gift of franchise, and this accounts for another leakage from the Faith.

Evidently, with the Society organized on such a basis, the possibilities are unlimited. We need have no fear that the men will interfere with, much less try to usurp our authority, Catholic laymen know their place. But how many offices they could and would perform if we would only show them how.

Needless to say, the moderator would have to follow the science of pedagogy and have besides unlimited patience. An occasional lecture by some prominent ecclesiastic or layman is good as far as it goes. But how far does it go? It is not the plain food that our men need. Certainly it is not enough. The uneven mental character of the Society as a class necessitates a different method. The lecture may mean much for a group of men with trained minds; it must mean little or nothing for men whose minds have received no special training. Teaching would have to be done with A B C simplicity to get results worth while. But after all it is just as important for the Kingdom of Christ that the ditcher should be able to justify the claims of the Catholic Church among ditchers, as that a lawyer should be able to prove that genuine Catholicity is the bulwark rather than the enemy of the American Constitution. Christ made the mysteries of Heaven intelligible for the rude unlettered fishermen as He did for the learned doctor of the Law. It was the erstwhile rude unlettered fishermen who made them plain for the world, because they are divine.

It would be interesting to know to what extent this plan has been tried and with what success. No doubt more than one priest has found it beneficial. At any rate it may hold some speculative interest for those who have not already given it a trial. It is enough if it serves the purpose of discussion, looking toward that consummation devoutly to be wished, a healthy lay apostolate, fortified with the correct Catholic point of view and the ready answer for the gross misrepresentations and objections that are constantly being hurled at the Church of God. That would be a splendid crusade surely.

We must always remember that the layman has been trained to follow our leadership, a fact that would seem to indict us rather than them on the charge of inactivity. Perhaps the appearance now and then in our Catholic periodicals of an article dealing with this very subject and signed by Catholic laymen may be an indication of their growing impatience and anxiety to get the new crusade under way.

JOSEPH C. FLEMING.

New York City.

FOUR REASONS WHY CATHOLICS MAY NOT LAWFULLY JOIN A MASONIC LODGE.

Priests are often asked by nominal Catholics why they should not be free to join the Masons. The answer is that the beliefs and principles of Catholics and Freemasons are opposed to each other, as is evident—

I.

From Authority.—All the Popes who have condemned Freemasonry say that a Catholic cannot be a Mason. The chief ones are: Clement XII, in 1738; Benedict XIV, in 1751; Pius VII, in 1821; Leo XII, in 1825; Pius VIII, in 1829; Gregory XVI, in 1839; Pius IX, in 1846 and 1865, and on four other occasions; Leo XIII, five different times, but especially in the Encyclical *Humanum Genus* of 20 April, 1884, and Pius X, in 1911.

No Catholic who has not lost his judgment will believe that in matters of religion he knows more than all these Popes combined.

II.

From Private Experience.—It is a fact that when a Catholic becomes a Mason and lives as such he ceases to practise his religion. It is not because they forbid him to do so in the Lodge, but because they make an unbeliever of him.

Those very persons who on their initiation into Masonry endeavor to steer a middle path, going both to the Lodge and to the Church, end by becoming unbelievers.

Whoever wishes a proof of this statement need only make a list of our best known public men, who were Catholics in youth and are now well known as Masons, and he will see that none of these retains any of his Catholic faith.

III.

From Public Experience.—All the revolutions engineered by Masonry have been so many persecutions of religion. Amongst others may be recalled the French Revolution of 1789, the Italian of 1848, the Spanish of 1869, that of the Commune of Paris in 1871; that of Portugal in 1910, and that of Mexico in 1911 and later years.

IV.

Intrinsic.—A man cannot be at the same time a Catholic and a Mahometan because Catholicity and Mahometanism teach different doctrines. For the same reason a man cannot be a Catholic and a Mason.

Let us compare some fundamental propositions of both religions.

Catholic Propositions.	Masonic Propositions.
1. God is the Creator of the world out of nothing.	God is the architect of the universe, and formed it of eternal matter.
2. God is One in Essence and three in Persons.	No one knows anything about God. Any concept that can be formed of Him is incomplete and erroneous. One concept of God is as good as another.
3. God is free to impose laws on men.	God is not free to decree laws. The laws of God are the forces of nature.
4. God has manifested Himself to the world in two ways: by reason and by revelation. God's revelation has been made through His Prophets and Apostles and through His Son Jesus Christ.	God manifests Himself to the world by means of the universe. Apart from that revelation there is no other knowledge of Him.
5. Man has the obligation of professing the religion which his Creator wishes.	Man is free to profess any religion (liberty of conscience).
6. The Catholic is the only true religion.	All religions are or may be true. There is no certainty on this point.
7. Man's soul is immortal, and consequently will live for eternity.	The soul of God can only be said to be immortal as long as it is not swallowed up by the Being of God, of which it is an emanation.
8. After death there is an eternal life of happiness for the good, and an eternal hell for the wicked.	Masonry does not concern itself with what happens after death.
9. Human laws are not binding if they are opposed to the divine.	Human laws are binding whenever they are passed by a majority. They are independent of the divine laws.
10. The Supreme Lord of the world is the God whom Catholics recognize and adore.	The supreme being of this sublunar world (since Masonry does not concern itself with any other) is Humanity, or, in the concrete, Man.

The preceding Masonic propositions are taken from the works of Albert Pike, which are, as it were, the Bible of Masonry.

The above list could be indefinitely prolonged with propositions relative to the private and public life of individuals, from which the idea of God is eliminated; relating also to morality, education, amusements, matrimony, divorce, etc., in all which

Masonry holds doctrines diametrically opposed to the Catholic faith.

It being plainly impossible to believe contrary doctrines, it follows as a consequence that it is impossible to be at the same time a Catholic and a Mason.

MANUEL PEYPOCH, S.J.

THE PRINTING OF THE MISSAL.

To the Editor, THE ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW.

The article anent "The Printing of the Missal" by "Celebrant" in the January number of the REVIEW is very much to the point. It voices the sentiment of priests in general, and it is to be hoped that it will have a good effect in more helpful future editions of the Missal. Faults similar to the glaring ones in the Missal pointed out by "Celebrant" also crop up in the new Breviary. Very often a prayer is cut in two. To take one instance out of many, in my Breviary (Desclée, 1914) on 30 November the *Oratio* of St. Andrew starts on the lower right-hand corner of page 649, and I am obliged to turn over the leaf to get the remainder on page 650. When one takes into consideration that priests use this prayer at least six times during the recitation of the Divine Office, it is plain what a discomfort arises. Faults of this nature are common throughout the four volumes of the Breviary. In like manner the printing of half the Antiphons of Vespers or Lauds on one side of a leaf and half on the other side is another stumbling block to patience and piety very often met with in our Breviaries.

But to come back to the Missal. I would urge that, besides amending the defects pointed out by "Celebrant", future editions should be printed in four parts; one for every season, just as we have a part of the Breviary for every season. In this way the book would be about one-fourth its present weight, more suited to the needs of the priest, and more portable for the server. The print could be larger and all the prayers, especially those of the Canon, could be so arranged as to be a help rather than a hindrance to the celebrant.

What say you, my fellow priests, to this motion?

ANOTHER CELEBRANT.

MARYKNOLL MISSION LETTERS. XXXVII.

Impressions of Japan.

On the day of our landing in Japan, we said our Masses in honor of Mary Immaculate, thanking her for the success of our trip thus far, and begging her to intercede with her Divine Son that the hearts of the people whose land we were approaching might be softened, and that His bloody death on Calvary's Hill might not be in vain for them.

We had packed our Mass kits and were preparing to leave the salon, when through the portholes to the north we distinguished the gray outline of the volcanic hills of Japan. Gradually they grew clearer and swarms of fishing boats began to dot the sea. The little brown men made a good catch, for every one we caught sight of was hauling in fish as fast as he could draw the line. We thought of St. Francis Xavier, who in these very islands was a true "fisher of men", drawing souls into Peter's Bark. As we watched the fishermen crowd their nets with the spoils of the sea, we breathed a prayer that the day might not be far distant when a new Xavier would rise up, to net in the souls of Japan and bring them to Christ.

After passing along the northern coast for a whole day, we finally turned in, to dream of Yokohama till morning. On awakening—and we were up with the sun—we found ourselves anchored in the harbor of Japan's great maritime city. Surely we were in the Orient—but to all appearances we might have been in any Occidental port. Big, ocean-going steamers were all about us, and on the shore large well-built granite wharves, with giant cranes, teemed with people, piles of freight, and the hustle-bustle that our minds had never associated with the drowsy, sleepy Orient.

A few minutes after passing through the necessary official medical inspection we were ashore and in the heart of a little group of friends who came down to the pier to do honor to Maryknoll's Superior and the first Maryknoll Sisters to work in the Orient. The first one to come forward renewed a friendship made several years ago, when Miss Ria Nobechi, a talented Japanese woman, spent about a year with our sisters at Maryknoll. After making arrangements to entertain the sisters in Tokyo, she left us; and almost immediately Bishop Berlioz

and his Vicar General, with Father Walters of the Morning Star School, Tokyo, and Father Lebarbey of the European Church on the Bluff of Yokohama, came up. With a few claps of his hands Father Lebarbey made rickshaws appear from nowhere, and after a little bargaining, which accompanies every transaction in the Orient, we were deposited at the foot of the long stairs leading to the "Bluff", Yokohama's European quarters.

Like every other place, Japan has seen changes since the war, and the *H. C. L.*, that causes so much complaint back home, is also "among those present" in little Nippon. It might seem surprising, but our little rickshaw trip cost our party more than would a similar trip in New York taxis, where rates are not very low. A feature writer in one of our New York papers comments on the fact that school teachers in Japan are paid only from twenty to forty dollars a month for their services. On its face value this statement would lead one to believe that our priests ought to have a fairly easy time in maintaining their schools. What the writer forgot to mention was that, with the twenty to forty dollars, there generally go house and upkeep, with board, which brings the total amount up to our American standard.

We left our sisters at the convent of St. Maur, and journeyed on down the street to the hospitable house of the Paris Foreign Mission Society, where we were cordially welcomed and royally entertained. One of the few descendants of the great Marquis de Lafayette is the simple Vicar General of Japan's poorest diocese—Hakodate. How many of our ardent admirers of the great Revolutionary hero would think of honoring Lafayette by doing something for the religion that inspired his ideals, by helping his descendant in far-off Japan?

In the afternoon we made a little trip out to Kamakura, to see the "great Diabutsu" that seems to ornament every Japanese advertisement. The trip there was beautiful. We passed through one little Japanese village after another and each was a bit of old artistic Japan, free from every trace of the West, and from the hideous red-brick-and-white-plaster "classical" buildings with which the modernized Japanese are supplanting their own attractive architecture. Perhaps we Americans are spoiled. We become so accustomed

to "enormity" that we expect to find huge values in the things of another nation, especially when it is known as one of the Powers. Well, the Diabutsu is not big enough to be imposing, and too gross to be called pretty. Someone called my attention to the typical expression on Buddha's face—of the Oriental temperament and ideal. Perhaps it was there, but I must frankly confess I did not see it. Perhaps my artistic sense is not what it should be. At any rate, on leaving the place I had a feeling which might be expressed in plain Sein Fein: "The Diabutsu wasn't what I expected, and I didn't think it would be."

On our return to Yokohama we had a good view of Mount Fuji. In courtesy to the season it had doffed its beautiful snow cap, but the majestic mountain rises so gracefully and towers so high above the flat surrounding country that one is not at a loss to understand why the Japanese love it so well and pay it the honors reserved for a god.

Our second day in Japan was a busy one. We finished our Masses, breakfasted early, and hurried off to Tokyo with Bishop Berlioz. Our first stop in the big city was at the Convent of the Madames of the Sacred Heart. When we saw the place we had to rub our eyes. I do not know how the Madames manage to erect such buildings, but they do it, and the one they have in Tokyo is as fine as any building we saw in all Japan. Though only twelve years in Japan, the Madames of the Sacred Heart have about six hundred pupils—all boarders. They have five buildings, a beautiful chapel, and about one hundred acres of choice Japanese real estate. Of course I did not see all the institutions of Japan, but certainly this school was the best of its kind that I did see. The sisters are proving themselves real missioners. They already have the daughters of some of the best families in Japan, and their evident love and sacrifice for those fortunate enough to come under their care are bearing fruit. One Sister alone was able to say, "Last year I managed to have a student baptized for each of the holy Virgins mentioned in the Canon of the Mass." May Australia send more of her like to Japan!

After dinner we left for the school conducted by the Sisters of St. Paul de Chartres. These Sisters have about thirteen hundred day pupils, all Japanese. The school is under the

supervision of the Japanese Educational Department, and religious education is taboo. After class hours, however, the Sisters may instruct the pupils in the principles of religion, and they report that their chapel is far too small to accommodate the numbers who attend Sunday Mass.

While we were at the school Captain Yamamoto, the sword-and-buckler of the Catholic lay movement in Japan, called to pay his respects to the Superior of Maryknoll. Captain Yamamoto is a convert, a graduate of the Morning Star School of Tokyo, conducted by the Brothers of Mary, a captain in the Japanese Navy, the French tutor of the Prince Imperial and present Regent of Japan, and was probably the man who inspired the Regent to seek audience with the late Pope, during his recent trip through Europe.

Miss Nobechi rightly believed that we would enjoy a quiet afternoon after our chase about Tokyo during the morning, so she thoughtfully secured through one of her old students (now the wife of a leading Japanese noble) permission for us to visit the Emperor's gardens. We went and enjoyed the place, getting about as near to imperial purple as we ever shall, and perhaps as near as is good for us.

Leaving Tokyo was like quitting a city of friends, and we settled down to rest that night at Yokohama with the general feeling that, while Japan may have her faults, they may be magnified. At midnight we quietly pulled out of the harbor and the next day found us saying our Masses at sea, with Kobe, our next Japanese stop, twenty-four hours away. During the day an official from one of the many evangelic mission societies in the Orient, came up to inform me all about the Catholic Church in Japan. It seems he worked there for two years and learned the language, native character, and nearly everything else worth knowing in that short time. I congratulated him, for, if he could command the Japanese language, he surely spoke a foreign tongue better than he did his native one; and if he knew all about the Catholic Church in Japan he certainly was better informed than most of the priests who worked there before he was born. When he told me that Catholics could not get on officially in Japan, I asked him if he ever heard of Captain Yamamoto, Captain Suru, or Prime Minister Hara, all Catholics, and all doing very well

in official Japan. Of course he did, but he did not think they were Catholics.

Our boat arrived at Kobe a few hours earlier than was expected, so we had to make our way as best we could to the Catholic Church. We knew "Ten-shu-do" meant Catholic Church, and with these three words, and the aid of a young Japanese who spoke about the same number of English words, we guided our little party to our haven of rest and friends. In the afternoon we made a little trip to Kyoto, the Rome of paganism, with a young English convert who had just completed his college course at the Brothers of Mary School, in Dayton, Ohio. Young Mr. C., who speaks Japanese like a native and a few European languages with equal facility, proved an invaluable companion on the trip, and I believe often saved our purse a heavy blow, for when he spoke to the different Japanese with whom we came in contact, they seemed to realize that there was someone in the party who knew what was what in Japan.

Our trip to Kyoto was enough to dispel any belief that the Japanese have abandoned paganism for atheism—a not uncommon rumor in the States. The trains seemed to be fairly pumping people into the city, and these were headed, every man, woman and child of them, for the temples. One temple particularly, with hundreds of smaller gods piled high for yards on either side of a large Buddha, seemed to do a thriving business. During the short time we were there at least two thousand people must have entered that temple park. At another temple there was even a greater crowd. Crowds were to be met within every one of the temples; nor were they curious holiday picnickers either, but people who came for devotion. One could not but wish these people would forsake their false gods and offer their prayers, which seemed sincere enough, to Him who died for them and who loves them with a love beyond human understanding. When we left Kyoto it was with a feeling of sorrow for the people and one almost akin to pity for Father Aurientis, the French priest who is isolated in this capital of Japanese heathendom. On all sides of him he has temples that are as large as many of our European cathedrals; he is alone to fight a religion that is liberally supported by the Government, and in this fight we

know he is shorthanded for the main sinews of war, efficient dollars.

Japan has been written up under so many phases, and often in such a laudatory way, that the Westerner is led to believe a new Athenean Empire has sprung up across the Pacific. We are informed of the cleanliness of Japan and told that, if cleanliness is next to godliness, the Japanese are in all the world the people closest to the Lord. I confess I have not been in every large city of the United States, but I have been in several and in a few capitals of Europe. In none of them were the sanitary conditions half so bad as they are in the best Japanese cities. It is true that the Japanese bathe often, but the whole family, with their servants, if they have any, bathe in turn in the same water in the one old wooden tub, and —we leave the rest to your imagination. Compared with other Orientals the Japanese are clean, but beside Occidentals the contrast becomes rather odious for Nippon's folk.

We continually hear that a traveller in Japan can get on very well with a knowledge of English alone, since all the Japanese study English in their high schools. Well, most of the high schools in the United States teach French or Spanish, but I daresay a Frenchman would have a shrugging old time of it trying to "parley" with the ordinary American high school student. The same is true in Japan. A good many of the people can say "How do you do", and some can even add the slangy "Good night!"—an expression probably picked up from Americans who tried to get the drift of their language when spoken in "English". The Japanese are an intelligent and sturdy little race, and deserve great credit for the strides they have made in educational and commercial lines, but they are no supermen, as some would have us believe.

At night, when we nestled in our berths as the boat pulled out of Kobe, we dreamed beautiful dreams of the days that were ahead of us in our passage through the famous Inland Sea, and even of the time, in the distant and hopeful future, when we might stop off at an American priest's house in Japan and labor with him for the conversion of this land already made precious by the blood of many martyrs.

PHILIP S. TAGGART, A.F.M.

THE LITURGICAL BLESSINGS ON THE VIGIL OF THE EPIPHANY.

I.

Qu. My neighbor, an exemplary parish priest to whom I often go for counsel and the unburdening of my difficulties, had a somewhat unusual celebration in his church on the vigil of the Epiphany. I came to his house about eleven o'clock a. m. with the intention of being shriven for the feast next day. At the door the housemaid told me that the Father was in the church. As I entered the sacristy, I heard, to my wonder, the solemn chant of the *Te Deum* with organ accompaniment and vested choristers carrying a large vat filled with water to the vestibule, whence the people afterward filled their separate vials. To my query as to the meaning of it all, my friend said: "Come into the house. You will stay for dinner and I shall explain." He immediately went to the 'phone, called up my housekeeper and said: "Father is detained and will take his dinner here." Later he showed me a finely copied set of prayers with the Gregorian chant, saying: "This is the ritual with which we bless the Epiphany water. It makes the people realize better the meaning of the feast and the blessings of the Church."

"But," I replied, "is there any authority for it in the Missal?" My venerable friend assured me that he had had the ceremony copied by one of the school Sisters from a late Roman Ritual, and that there was something about it in the ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW some years ago. Unfortunately, I have no General Index of the REVIEW, though I hope you can send me one. Meanwhile, as I find no trace of the rite, in missal or ritual, I ask for enlightenment, for I should like very much to follow the example of my neighbor, if it is authorized. NEO-SACERDOS.

Resp. In 1890 (17 May) the S. Congregation was asked whether the solemn blessing of water on the vigil or the feast of the Epiphany, which is common in the Greek Church, may legitimately be adopted in churches of the Latin rite, as is being done among American immigrants from the Græco-Latin districts in Europe. The answer was that no other rite was to be introduced but that given in the Roman Ritual, i. e. the ordinary blessing of water on Sundays. Shortly afterward, however, the Holy See sanctioned a special solemn "Benedictio Aquae in Vigilia Epiphaniae Domini", with a separate formula duly approved (6 December, 1890). This blessing is found in the recent typical edition of the Roman Ritual, but not in the

new Missal. It consists of the Litany of the Saints, chanted kneeling, ending with *Pater noster . . . et ne nos inducas*, etc. Then follow three Psalms, "Afferte Domino, filii Dei" (28), "Deus noster refugium" (45), and "Laudate Dominum" (146). Next the celebrant chants the Exorcism, concluding with "Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus Dominus Deus Sabaoth". After this the chanters take up the antiphon "Hodie caelesti sponso juncta est Ecclesia", followed by the canticles *Benedictus* and *Magnificat*.

The celebrant now chants *Dominus vobiscum* and the oration taken from the office of the Epiphany, "Deus qui hodierna die Unigenitum tuum Gentibus stella duce revelasti", after which the *Ordo ad faciendam Aquam benedictam* used for Sunday, given in the ritual and missal, is carried out in full with the exorcism and blessing of the salt and water. It may prevent confusion to note here that the exorcism which the celebrant chants at the beginning of the ceremony is the one found in the Appendix of the Roman Ritual under the title "Exorcismus in satanam et angelos apostaticos" which was issued by Leo XIII. In the present ceremony it begins with the words "Exorcizamus te". The function ends with the *Te Deum*; after which the people take some of the blessed water for their homes and the sick.

The significance of this blessing is that it marks the opening of the Epiphany cycle in the ecclesiastical year, and offers an opportunity to explain the continual care of the Church for her children in the daily course of their lives and for the sick. It is in this way that the sacramental channels flowing from the Tabernacle in our churches are utilized. Our Catholic people thus find a way to keep faith in the mysteries of religion, and to make holiday for the Lord as readily as they will for the civic festivals which a secular sense of gratitude inspires.

II.

Qu. Some Catholic families are accustomed to mark the doors of their houses for the feast of the Epiphany with the letters C. M. B., and a cross between each of the letters, which stand for the supposed names of the three Wise Men from the East. These people ask the priest to bless the doors with holy water, after which they invite guests to a feast, the priest being supposed to stay with them as at a wedding or christening. Is there any sanction for this?

Resp. An old custom exists of blessing a piece or pieces of chalk which are afterward used to mark the doors of houses with the initials of the three holy Kings from the East, Caspar, Melchior, Balthasar, who are supposed to bring a special blessing on the inhabitants. A formula for this is found in the Roman Ritual (Benedictio *Cretae* in Festo Epiphaniae).

RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEFRAUDING AN INSURANCE COMPANY.

Qu. Cajus, a man of moderate means, lives in a house some distance from the church. As a result, he attends Mass very rarely. Caja, his wife, often asks him to move closer to the church, but he refuses. Caja thereupon decides to take matters into her own hands and determines to destroy the home. Knowing that her husband and the insurance company will question her, she asks her brother, Paulus, to fire the home for her. Paulus does so. The home is burned and Cajus receives the insurance money, not knowing the part played by his wife. Paulus now comes to confession.

1. What principles could be given covering the defrauding of insurance companies? I have been told that such companies take out insurance with other companies, and these with other companies, etc., so that it would be difficult to find the exact loser.

2. Would Caja be bound to reimburse her husband in case the insurance did not fully cover the loss? Would she have to reimburse her husband if the insurance company refused to settle? (Cf. Sabetti-Barrett, Ed. 27, No. 404, quest 2.)

3. What should the confessor tell Paulus, and what are his obligations?

4. What should the confessor tell Caja should she come to confession to him at some future time?

Resp. 1. Though the occurrence of disaster and misfortune is most uncertain with regard to any individual, some accidents are certain to happen to somebody, and the number of occurrences over a long period of time, and in communities of considerable extent, is approximately regular. Insurance is a method of distributing losses which occur to certain individuals so that they are divided among a whole community. This is accomplished by means of a fund created by the payment of comparatively small sums as premiums. In the case of fire insurance this premium may be regarded as a tax imposed by commercial necessity, the amount being computed from the

fire-loss experience. The insurance collected by any individual does not bring back the property destroyed, but equalizes the loss among all the insured. Hence the greater number of fires the higher the premium and vice versa.

A fire-insurance company will issue a policy for a greater amount than it is able or willing to carry, or may write a greater amount of insurance than it desires to carry individually, and then reinsure the excess in one or several other companies, in order to distribute more widely the possible loss. The company that writes the original policy, however, remains legally responsible to the policy-holder for the full amount of the policy. The practice is to reinsure each policy individually, or, in contract insurance, to keep a record of each policy and of the company which has reinsured the risk. In many States, a policy for fire insurance carries a co-insurance clause which is not generally understood. By virtue of this clause the insurance company binds itself to pay the total loss if the property is insured for its full value; to pay the total loss up to 80%, if the property is insured for 80% of the total value; if the property is insured for less than 80% of the total value, the insurance company holds itself liable to pay only the proportion of the loss, that the amount insured bears to 80% of the value of the property. Thus if a property valued at $10,000 were insured for $6,000, on a loss of $4,000, the company would pay only $3,000, thus compelling the insured to share the risk and penalizing him for partial insurance.

The business of fire insurance in this country is conducted in two ways: (1) by private corporations which collect premiums and repair losses in order to derive therefrom a profit; (2) by organizations not formed for profit, but solely for equitable distribution of burdens, as mutual companies.

A person who ignites an insured property inflicts an injury on the stockholders of a stock organization, and in all cases imposes a needless burden on all the insured, and is a contributing cause to the increase of all fire-insurance premiums, as one more loss is added to the fire experience loss on which they are based. For this reason it is hazardous to hold that the insured may be presumed willing that the offender restore the loss in other channels, especially in view of the fact that almost half the fire loss is caused by incendiarism.

In strict justice, restitution should be made to the insurance company, taking measures to specify the particular fire loss the sum restored is intended to cover. Presuming that the person is able to restore, two reasons may excuse from this obligation and allow restitution to be made to the poor or to pious causes. First, when the particular loss cannot be specified without exposing the guilty party, as reputation is a good of a higher order than external goods, e. g., money. Second, if it is morally certain that the sum restored will not reach the rightful owners. The danger of exposure may be averted as a rule by the use of a prudent intermediary and should not universally be presumed. The second condition is generally assumed to be verified on account of the custom of reïnsurance. However, as each risk is reinsured in such a way as to keep the company or companies reïnsuring distinct, this assumption is without a real basis, and the money restored is morally certain to be returned to the parties injured. The insistence on the part of the insured that the money be returned to the company cannot be said to be unreasonable, as it is based not so much on the amount restored to each as on the fear of increased premiums which will result and which will continue indefinitely. As this injustice is commonly unforeseen, restitution on this head cannot be demanded.

2 and 4. Caja had in mind two effects to follow the burning of the house; one a good one, to secure the attendance of her husband at Mass; the other an evil one, to secure compensation unjustly from the insurance company. As the latter was the determining factor, without which the house would not have been burnt, the action is unjust, and she is bound in justice to make restitution to the insurance company.

Under our laws wives may own and dispose of property in their own name. We may presume that the house involved belonged to the "bona communia", goods common to wife and husband, the result of his labor and her frugal administration. If Caja owned property in her own name she would be obliged to make restitution to the insurance company, and to her husband, or rather to the "bona communia". If she has no property of her own, condonation may safely be presumed on the part of the husband. As regards the insurance company, it would hardly be possible for her to subtract sufficient money for restitution from the "bona communia" with-

out acquainting her husband with her crime and thus losing her good name. This she is not bound to do, as reputation is of a higher order than external goods. All that may then be demanded is the will to restore whenever the ability to do so is present.

3. The confessor should tell Paulus that since he acted at the behest of another, he was the secondary but immediate cause of the injury and hence the obligation of restitution rests upon him if Caja, the principal though remote cause, is unable or unwilling to repair the loss. In her default, he is bound to restore to the insurance company the amount of the damage on the principle cited above, but may have recourse to Caja, even by occult compensation, to compel her to reimburse him. As regards any loss to Cajus, if the insurance money did not cover the total damage, he may presume that condonation has been made to Caja, and hence is not bound to make restitution on this head, unless he has knowledge that the contrary is true.

THE THREE CRUCIFIXES OF GOLGOTHA.

Qu. The approach of Lent brings into prominence the Crucifix and the story of the Passion. In all pictures and other representations of the Crucifixion the figure of our Lord is shown to be fastened to the cross with nails; but the two thieves appear as only bound with cords or ropes. At the Passion Play of Oberammergau I noticed the same distinction. I have never been able to find any reason for this. Will the REVIEW kindly enlighten the writer and others who may be equally puzzled?

Resp. The distinction noted is not based on definite historical records, nor is it quite universally observed in art. One of the oldest crucifixion scenes in a Syriac codex of the sixth century (in the Laurentiana at Florence) depicts the thieves aside of our Lord as nailed to their crosses. Duccio and Fra Angelico (Museo S. Marco, Florence) do the same. Michael Angelo Grigoletti nails the thief at the right of our Lord to the cross, while he binds the other with ropes. Recent artists, like Max Klinger, follow the same method. Only for the fact that our Lord was actually nailed to the cross have we any authentic record. For the rest, Christian art has accepted in

the main the distinction which ties the two thieves with ropes, and there appears good reason, apart from any trustworthy documentary chronicle, for the distinction.

It is well known that the awful torture of crucifixion was originally confined to Egyptian and Babylonian barbarism. In the countries under Roman law, culprits condemned to the cross were killed by strangulation or some other method of torture and afterward tied to a stake or cross as a mark of disgrace. In later times there was the custom of beating or scourging the criminal, and then, without awaiting his death, of tying him to the cross where he was allowed to expire. This method frequently caused the condemned to linger in torture for hours or even days, until they were exhausted by the gradual loss of blood from the wounds of their scourged bodies. When they survived beyond the period desirable for some public cause, their bones were broken, so that they might die before being taken down from the cross.

In the case of our Lord's crucifixion, the time for execution after the Sanhedrim had procured the condemnation before Pilate, permitted but little delay because of the near approach of the Pascal Sabbath, when the bodies of the condemned had to be taken down and buried before sunset. In these circumstances the briefer mode of crucifixion, by nailing the body to the cross after the scourging, was more likely to shorten the agony and secure the death of the Victim before evening. The purpose of our Lord's accusers had been accomplished in the disgrace attached to the crucifixion. The historical data of the Gospels attest the fulfilment of the prophecy that no bone of the Saviour's body was to be broken. In the case of the two culprits crucified at the same time we have no such data. It is not unlikely that they had been condemned in the regular process of the Roman law, and that their execution had taken place somewhat earlier. Probably they had been hanging on the crosses for some time before the sad scene of their Lord's execution; and as there had been no urgency in their case they were, after the customary scourging, tied to the trees and left in their agony to bleed to death. We know that their bones were broken afterward to make sure of death, while in the case of our Lord no such attempt was made. All of this indicates that His execution

was a separate act of penalty, and not merely a part of a triple execution.

To this probability of a distinct mode of crucifixion, due to the different circumstances of the condemnation and the brief time allowed for our Lord's execution, Christian sentiment has added the esthetic element which gives an essentially different aspect and character to the Saviour's crucifixion from that of the two robbers. They writhe, their bones are broken, they die according to the process of common criminal law. The significance of the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb which forbids the breaking of bones has no appplication to them. Thus the artist instinctively expresses the Catholic sense in marking the difference by the mode of presenting the Crucifixion. The sentiment has become common and is now assured as an attribute of the Passion scenes which inspire and accompany our devotion. The pious revelations and visions of saintly contemplatives confirm the Catholic sentiment, and we rest in it as a fact.

THE INDEX OF FORBIDDEN BOOKS.

Qu. Some time ago I was asked whether a certain book — *The Double Doctrine of the Church of Rome*—is on the Index. I did not know. Indeed I have never seen the Index and would not know where to get it. Can one get the latest translation? Where?

Resp. The Index of Forbidden Books is to the confessor and spiritual director, what the "Rogues' Gallery" is to the police officer. It is not intended, nor would it be wise, to publish it at the street corners or in show windows; nor is every officer of the law supposed to have it by memory or a copy of it in his pocket or house. The answer to give to persons who inquire about a particular book of which you don't know, is plainly: "Why do you ask? If you suspect that the book is bad and hence forbidden, don't read it, unless you have to—which is a rare contingency. Treat the doubtful book as you would treat a doubtful specimen of mushroom, when you are hunting for food or delicacy in the field. If you have a suspicion that it is poison, let it alone." The chief object of the Index is to prevent writers from further producing or making effective the poison by popularity. Their

wares are branded as noxious, thus making their activity unpopular. This implies of course also the purpose of preventing the reading, since authors write to have others read what they can get printed. For the rest, we think it just as unwise to popularize and translate the Index as to advertise the Police album of criminals, though the latter serves a highly useful purpose in detecting criminals and thereby lessening crime.

THE OBLIGATION OF THE NUPTIAL MASS.

Qu. Will you kindly state in the REVIEW whether or not there is anything in canons 1100 and 1101 or in any other canon of the new Code imposing an obligation on the pastors of souls to refuse to marry Catholic couples unless they have a Nuptial Mass?

My neighbor interprets the new Code to this effect and will not marry any couples unless they consent to have a Nuptial Mass. This course is full of dangers for the couples involved, to say nothing of the trouble it gives this good priest's neighbors.

Resp. The Code imposes no obligation of celebrating marriage with a Nuptial Mass, however much the Church desires this manner of receiving worthily the Sacrament of Matrimony. In chapter VI of the Canons touching the celebration of marriage the Code lays down the rules to be observed in the form of celebrating marriage under Catholic sanction or in presence of the priest and witnesses. Here the rite prescribed in the Ritual or the Missal must be followed, with such approved customs as do not derogate from the essential form of the sacred contract (can. 1100).

In the next canon (1101) the Code speaks of the solemn blessing, which may or may not accompany the marriage, and which, though much to be desired in all cases, is not of the essence of the sacramental contract. Of this blessing the Code says, "curet parochus ut sponsi benedictionem sollemnem accipiant". This *curet* (which word derives from *quaero*, and has the meaning of endeavor) is equivalent to "persuade" or "induce", not to "oblige". Hence P. Blat, interpreting the canon for the pastor, writes: "curet *cum prudentia* ut sponsi *post matrimonium contractum* benedictionem sollemnem accipiant" (*Commentar. Textus Juris Canonici*, Lib. III, De

Sacrament. tit. VII). When this solemn blessing is given, it must be done in the Mass. We may urge people newly married to avail themselves of a blessing, but we cannot force it upon them.

SCRUPLES OR SINS?

Qu. Johanna comes to confession, tells that she has bad thoughts while praying and that she always has lustful emotions from her confessor. She appears to be very scrupulous. The confessor stops her immediately and asks her to mention her worst sin. She mentions a non-consummated act with her husband, hardly a mortal sin. The confessor thereupon gives her a penance and absolves her. 1. What rules govern such cases. 2. Did the confessor act correctly?

Resp. The confessor in this case does not seem to have fulfilled all the obligations of his office as doctor and medicus. If the penitent, in the judgment of the confessor, betrayed an evil intent in the matter she confessed, she was beyond doubt "indisposita" and should not have received absolution. If, as is presumed, no evil intent was discerned, and she exhibited an extremely scrupulous conscience, by the nature of the matter confessed, he was justified in not insisting on material integrity in the confession, but he should have made some endeavor to assist the penitent in her difficulty. If the emotions she confessed were found to be peculiar to the present confessor, he should have directed her to another confessor. If the emotions were always experienced in confession, he should have admonished her; (1) that these thoughts in all probability were not sins; (2) that solicitude concerning them only aggravated them; (3) that the best procedure was to ignore them; (4) that their cause might be physical and might yield to medical treatment.

MASS OFFERINGS ON ALL SOULS' DAY.

Qu. Please explain the Quaer. XX (p. 660), Sabetti-Barrett, *Theol. Moralis* (edit. XXVIII), about Mass offerings on All Souls' Day. Does it mean that any number of stipends may be accepted, and all of them satisfied by simply saying one Mass for all the intentions on All Souls' Day?

Resp. If the donors of Mass stipends on All Souls' Day are given clearly to understand in advance that the offerings they may make for a Mass on All Souls' Day are for the combined intentions of that day's Mass by the celebrant, the stipends may be accepted for the one Mass. Such is the interpretation implied in the decision of the Sacred Congregation; and in view of present conditions which cause many devout persons to make an offering to the Church or her ministers for the souls in Purgatory on a day when every altar is a privileged altar, the interpretation is reasonable.

THE LIGHTS AT SOLEMN REQUIEM MASS.

Qu. In a solemn requiem Mass should the candles of the acolytes be burning or not as they go to the altar from the sacristy?

Should the candles be taken to the reading of the Gospel by the deacon; and if so, should they be lighted or extinguished?

There is a variety of practice, and what we found in authors does not seem sufficiently clear.

Resp. The candles should be lighted; but not be carried at the Gospel. The "Ritus Celebrandi Missam" indicates this difference with sufficient clearness (Chap. II, n. 5), "In Missa solemni . . . acolythi . . . deferunt candelabra cum candelis accensis quae deinde collocantur super credentia." In a later rubric on the Missa Solemnis (Chap. VI, n. 5) we read: "Diaconus, praecedentibus thuriferario et duobus acolythis cum candelabris accensis de Credentia desumptis vadit cum Subdiacono ad locum Evangelii". To this an exception is made in solemn requiem Masses, as appears from the subsequent rubric in chapter XIII which has the title: "De his quae omittuntur in Missis pro Defunctis", and in which we read: (n. 2) "*Non* tenentur luminaria ad Evangelium, nec portatur incensum, sed duo tantum acolythi *sine candelabris* stant, unus a dextris, alter a sinistris subdiaconi tenentis librum Evangeliorum". For the rest, that chapter makes no change in the "ingressus sacerdotis (cum ministris) ad altare".

CONCERNING DANCES.

Qu. We are suffering in this diocese from an epidemic of dances given for the benefit of different churches. A parish priest has incurred a debt of a couple of thousand dollars in fixing up a "community house", and this debt is being paid by the proceeds from dances always given on Sunday nights. Another priest who lives in a poor parish gives dances at regular dates for the support of the church and the pastor. Still another has built a rectory, and dances are on the program to raise the money.

During an entire week a bazaar was held for the benefit of the cathedral and every night dancing was in order, probably to get a crowd, as we say here in the West. On the occasion of Confirmation services in one of the parishes a dance was given, and kept up until two o'clock in the morning, "praesente episcopo", as I am told.

I believe a decree against this kind of practice was issued by Rome in 1909 or 1910 or by the Apostolic Delegate. If there is such a decree or letter, it doesn't seem to be known to anyone in authority here. Would you please say whether there is or not?

Resp. In answer to complaints similar to the ones here mentioned, the Sacred Congregation of Consistory issued a decree (10 December, 1917) forbidding priests to promote or be present at such diversions organized for the purpose of aiding charitable and religious enterprises. We have discussed the matter fully on former occasions; but the remedy for the evil lies not in much quoting of law and demonstrating of the law's reasonableness. What we priests need most, is a clear and unsentimental realization of our position and responsibility as moral teachers. Much of what we call theology in the seminary might be translated into common sense and the fundamental truths of the Penny Catechism.

Dancing is not a sin; but fostering immoral attitudes, indiscriminate love-making, rousing sensual passions, by word, act, or suggestion, is, or readily leads to, sin. Whether the diversion which we call dancing comes under this category or not is not a matter to be defined by forms of words or laws; it is a matter of conscientious observance and judicious direction on the part of a fatherly priest or pastor who is anxious to keep his children from the harm of sin and the contamination of vice and vulgar self-indulgence. On the whole, popular and fash-

ionable dancing in these days among our mixed religious congregations takes on the form of temptation to sensual acts which lead to sin. It is forbidden by the law of God. The fact that ecclesiastical law forbids priests to take part in such diversions by their presence or approval is a warning that the Church regards the practice of popular dancing in the light of a danger, though she cannot in every case determine the degree of sinfulness involved, since this is a matter of circumstance which the director of conscience, the confessor and pastor must determine in each case.

The remedy for whatver evils we have to complain of here lies in careful catechizing, zealous, constant and well prepared preaching on the precepts and truths of religion; it lies furthermore in a holy, priestly life which lends weight to the words of the pastor; and often much more in prudent silence about the things and above all about the guilty persons that are out of our reach of correction. We do not accept the insinuation of the bishop's presence at midnight revels as true; though one can imagine even a bishop to be asleep when his office of "overseer" bids him be awake.

ADDITION TO THE LITANY OF THE SAINTS.

Qu. I have been looking for an approved translation in English of the late addition to the Litany of the Saints, "Ut omnes errantes ad unitatem Ecclesiae revocare, et infideles universos ad Evangelii lumen perducere digneris".[1] The *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* gives only the Latin text. Where may I find the approved translation?

Resp. The following translation has episcopal approval:

"That Thou wouldst vouchsafe to bring back to the unity of the Church all those who have strayed away, and lead to the light of the Gospel all unbelievers."

PRAYER "FIDELIUM" IN A "MISSA PRO VIVIS".

Qu. When the Ordo gives the oratio "Fidelium" as the third prayer in the Mass (e. g. on 18 December), in order, as I understand, to gain the special indulgences of a black Mass formerly allowed on such days, may I omit this prayer when the Mass is offered for the living?

[1] S. R. C., 22 March, 1922.—ECCL. REVIEW, Vol. LXVI, p. 605.

Resp. No. The rubrics as indicated in the Ordo are preceptive; and the prayer *pro defunctis* added to the orations of the day does not vitiate the intention "pro vivis" any more than does the "memento pro defunctis" after the consecration. The application is inclusive.

THE THIRD ORATION AND THE "IMPERATA" AT MASS.

Qu. 1. Looking over the Ordo for 1923, I find the third oration at Mass at times marked *L. I.*, which, according to the *signa,* means that the oratio imperata may take the place of the third oration. Is this correct? I can find no authorities for the statement.

2. If the third oration is *Pro Ecclesia aut pro Papa* and the Ordinary had prescribed the *oratio pro Papa,* must both be said?

Resp. 1. In the "Additiones et Variationes in Rubricas Missalis", under n. VI, we have the following rubric: "Orationi tamen *ad libitum* pro diversitate temporum assignatae substitui potest collecta, si qua extat, ab Ordinario imperata." This *ad libitum oratio in tertio loco* occurs in the Missal from 3 February to Tuesday after Quinquagesima, and from Trinity Sunday to the first Sunday in Advent.

2. When the third oration is *Pro Ecclesia aut pro Papa* and the imperata is *Pro Papa*, it suffices to say the latter as the third oration. "Si jussa fuerit oratio contra persecutores Ecclesiae vel pro Papa in diebus in quibus alterutra a rubricis praescribitur, unica oratione (imperata) utrumque adimpletur praeceptum." [1] Formerly both orations had to be said.

[1] L. c., VI, 4.

Ecclesiastical Library Table

RECENT PHILOSOPHICAL LITERATURE.

The keen interest displayed in philosophical problems of every kind and the extensive research carried on along the most varied lines of inquiry are both encouraging and promising. They are calculated to arouse the hope that all these activities will yet result in bringing about some measure of harmony among the many conflicting systems; for it is inconceivable that philosophical speculation should for ever move in a wearisome treadmill without ever reaching a glimpse of the truth and obtaining a firm hold on reality. In no field has humanity been so long frustrated of worth while results, and in no field have its efforts been so poorly repaid as in that of metaphysical thought. Perhaps the hour has at last come when it will reap on this hitherto barren field. In this optimistic spirit we look upon the present situation.[1]

[1] Others share this optimism. Thus Professor Arthur Kenyon Rogers concludes his recent history of philosophy on a hopeful note. "If the historian of the future," he writes, "is to be in a position to find a dramatic tendency in the evolution of philosophy, it is clearly not in the year 1922 that his plot will culminate. The almost feverish activity of the last few decades is in striking contrast to the apathy with which the nineteenth century opened; but the universe still seems as far from having come to the consciousness of its own rationality in the philosophical as in the political field. Only an optimist, or a convinced partisan, is likely to find in the discussions of the present moment the resolution of that uncertainty and lack of common agreement which has so often been used to put the philosopher apologetically on the defensive. In spite of what is perhaps a growing disposition on the part of the members of one school to learn in matters of detail from another, the philosophical atmosphere is still sharply controversial rather than coöperative, and the leading schools all diverge at the very outset by insisting on the adoption of a special, and usually a more or less non-natural standpoint, before the pupil can be instructed in the one true faith. . . . But if a fraction of the effort once were made to enter into the difficulties and the insights of other thinkers that now goes to following out the logical consequences of a single insight and defending it against competitors, philosophers might fairly be expected to discover that logical agreement, like ethical agreement, is less improbable than the particularism of our first and natural instincts might lead us to suppose; since it is in fact to a narrow and exclusive sense of what is valuable rather than to rational considerations, that this philosophical particularism is almost always due. Systems would probably suffer in the process; but systems have had their chance, and have still to show their ability to cure the ills of philosophy." — *English and American Philosophy since 1800.* A Critical Study. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1922; pp. 468.

W. S. Sheldon also raises his voice against philosophical particularism and earnestly pleads for a greater catholicity. Cf. *The Strife of Systems and Productive Duality,* 1918. Father Stanislaus von Dunin-Borkowski, S.J., writes in a similar strain: "The philosophical views of the old school and of the modern groups are beginning to seek common ground and mutual contact. This is a

Attempts at Philosophical Synthesis. The day of metaphysical construction, that would sum up and embody in a harmonious whole the scattered results of specialized research, has not yet come. There still prevail a pronounced aloofness and shyness with regard to anything that suggests metaphysics.[2] Disastrously this antimetaphysical trend manifests itself with respect to psychology, which is being more and more divorced from all metaphysical implications and placed on a purely and exclusively experiential basis. Still this caution and timidity in presence of the cosmic problems that confront man and challenge his mind may to an extent be commended; it is preferable by all means to the intolerable arrogance that would explain the universe in one dialectical formula. We single out a few typical constructive efforts.

Bernard Bosanquet champions with a brilliant display of dialectics and in a style both rich and well balanced the tra-

considerable improvement upon things as they stood fifty years ago. It was then regarded as impossible that there could be any approach between the two. To-day there is persistent groping for channels of communication and lines of transition. An agreement with respect to fundamental questions comes within measurable distance. Scheler has already attempted a synthesis of scholastic and modern philosophy. We may begin to dream of a signpost that will bear the happy legend: Toward a common world philosophy."—"Auf dem Weg zur Weltphilosophie", in *Stimmen der Zeit,* Jan., 1921. The same sentiment is echoed from another quarter in eloquent and stirring accents: "Nous marchons donc", says Dr. Paul Neve, "sans doute vers un réalisme résolu, attentif à la leçon de prudence que la guerre a donnée à tous égards. Trop de théories sociales, économiques et même philosophiques ont été balayées par cette tourmente pour que nous n'en conservions pas le souci de donner à nos idées les plus solides attaches expérimentales. Nous nous défierons des systèmes où l'entendement, se nourrissant de sa propre substance, prétendrait construire le monde à l'aide d'une dialectique formelle et nous entendrons faire une place à tout ce que les raisons du coeur nous suggèrent dans l'explication de la vie. . . . Et s'il est vain d'espérer qu'elle (la philosophie) trouvera, dans cette voie, les bases d'un accord définitif entre les penseurs, on peut cependant prévoir qu'elle y trouvera le moyen de diminuer les malentendus et de faire régner, entre les ouvriers de la pensée, la mutuelle estime que se doivent tous ceux qui, d'une âme droite, cherchent la lumière et s'inquiètent de la vérité." — "La Philosophie à la Veille de la Guerre", in *Annales de l'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie,* Louvain, 1920.

[2] Dr. René Kremer, C.SS.R., deplores this attitude of renunciation with regard to metaphysical construction and trusts that the Realists will cast off this reserve and plant their feet boldly on metaphysical terrain. "Enfin", he says, "il faut espérer que les réalistes critiques ne resteront pas toujours aussi défiants de la métaphysique. L'épistémologie ne peut s'achever sans elle. M. Durant Drake l'a bien senti, et les considérations de M. Santayana sur la substance et les essences appellent des compléments métaphysiques, ou plutôt, quoi qu'en pense l'auteur, elles ressortissent déja à cette partie de la philosophie; mieux vaut alors s'y engager résolument et pousser l'analyse à fond." — "Un Nouvel Essai de Réalisme en Amérique", in *Revue Néo-Scolastique de Philosophie,* Louvain, Aug. 1922.

ditional idealism and absolutism.[3] Douglas Fawcett brings forth a new principle of world unity which he calls divine imagining.[4] In Italy Benedetto Croce and Giovanni Gentile offer a modified form of Hegelianism.[5] Voluntarism finds strong supporters in Wilhelm Windelband[6] and Percival Frutiger.[7] A somewhat fainthearted defence of Theism is made by Professor W. R. Matthews.[8] Also the Philosophy of the Baron von Huegel has a decided theistic and Christian orientation.[9] The Viscount Haldane and Sir Henry Jones lean toward idealism and some form of divine immanence.[10]

[3] *The Meeting of Extremes in Contemporary Philosophy;* London, Macmillan and Co.; 1921; *What is Religion?,* London, Macmillan and Co.; 1920. Of course, it is difficult to see how there can be any room for religion in a pantheistic system; yet the author says some beautiful things about religion. We quote a passage: "To each of us, religion seems to say, good is and must be offered in our own individual form. My battle is continuous with yours, but it is not quite yours; yours helps me in mine, but it is not quite the same. We are sent on diverse missions, and all of them are necessary to the good" (p. 42).

[4] *Divine Imagining:* An Essay on the First Principles of Philosophy; London, Macmillan and Co.; 1921. This work was preceded by a previous volume entitled, *The World as Imagination.* Cf. Jakob Frohschammer, *Die Phantasie als Grundprinzip des Weltprocesses,* 1877.

[5] *Benedetto Croce: An Introduction to his Philosophy.* By Raffaello Piccoli; New York, Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1922; *La Filosofia di Giovanni Gentile.* Per Emilio Chiocchetti, O.F.M.; Milano, Vita e Pensiero, 1922; *Giovanni Gentile, The Theory of Mind as Pure Act;* translated from the third edition (Teoria generale dello spirito come Atto Puro) with an introduction by H. Wildon Carr; London, Macmillan and Co., 1922.

[6] *An Introduction to Philosophy;* translated by Joseph McCabe; London, T. Fisher Unwin, 1921. According to Windelband, even the predicate true is a value predicate. The outcome of his philosophy is not encouraging. It culminates in this hopeless conclusion: "There is a rent in reality; besides the values which realize themselves in it there is a dark power that is indifferent and hostile to value."

[7] *Volonté et Conscience;* Paris, Felix Alcan, 1920. The author himself calls his work an essay in spiritual monism. Matter is "un fantôme qui s'évanouira au moment ou l'on croira la saisir."

[8] *Studies in Christian Philosophy,* being the Boyle Lectures, 1920; London, Macmillan and Co. First Theism is set forth as a live option, then the preference for it is clinched by an appeal to the moral argument. The author is still under the spell of Kantianism.

[9] *Essays and Addresses in the Philosophy of Religion;* London, J. M. Dent & Sons, 1921.

[10] Viscount Haldane, *The Reign of Relativity;* London, John Murray, 1921. By the same author, *The Philosophy of Humanism;* New Haven, Yale University Press, 1922. We quote from the first volume: "God can hardly be less than the process of mind in an ideal integrity, the process in which mind as all-comprehending is ever realizing itself as a series of degrees which are divergent logically in so far as they are different in its dominant conceptions which lie at their respective foundations. . . . God is present in us, and it is in God that our fully developed reality must center" (pp. 385-399). Sir Henry

Several new manuals of Scholastic Philosophy have appeared, but though they may be useful and answer a real need (and we have no desire to deny that), they do not contribute toward the enrichment of knowledge nor in any sense advance human thought.[11] Something more than a recasting of pre-existing materials is required. Our Catholic thinkers might show a little more hardihood and press forward at certain points. We must not forget that St. Thomas in his own days was looked upon with suspicion by the fearful and regarded as a dangerous innovator. Had he been satisfied to restate merely what had been said by his predecessors, he would never have gained in the world of learning the position which he now holds.[12]

Jones, *A Faith that Enquires.* The Gifford Lectures in the years 1920 and 1921; London, Macmillan & Co. Cf. W. L. Davidson, *Recent Theistic Discussion;* London, T. & T. Clark.

[11] Josephus Gredt, O.S.B., *Elementa Philosophiae Scholasticae;* Friburgi, Herder, 1922; Seb. Uccello, S.S.S., *Philosophia Scholastica;* Augustae Taurinorum, Marietti, 1922; Bernardus Franzelin, S.J., *Quaestiones selectae ex philosophia fundamentali;* Oeniponte, Rauch, 1921; J. A. Endres, *Einleitung in die Philosophie;* Kempten, Jos. Koesel, 1920; A. Deneffe, S.J., *Kant und die Katholische Wahrheit;* Freiburg, Herder, 1922; Noele Maurice-Denis, *L'être en puissance d'après Aristote et Saint Thomas d'Aquin;* Paris, Marcel Riviere, 1922; N. Balthasar, *L'Etre et les principes métaphysiques;* Louvain; Fr. J. M. Ramirez, O.P., *De Analogia secundum doctrinam aristotelico-thomisticam* (Extrait de la Ciencia Thomista), Matriti, ap. S. Dominicum regalem, 1922. Cf. Mandonnet, O.P. et J. Destret, O.P., *Bibliographie thomiste;* Kain, *Le Saulchoir,* 1921.

[12] Dr. B. Landry draws attention to the revolutionary character of the teaching of St. Thomas and signals several points on which he deviated from the then prevailing doctrine and struck out new paths. "S. Thomas", he says, "apparut à ses contemporains comme un esprit hardi et son biographe Guillaume de Tocco, dans un texte souvent cité, insiste sur les nouveautés de son enseignement: les auditeurs qui écoutaient le maître dominicain défendre des vérités nouvelles avec des arguments nouveaux, ne se doutaient pas que Dieu n'eût éclairé ce génie novateur des rayons d'une lumière nouvelle et, convaincus, ils n'hésitaient pas à propager le vérité nouvelle. Tous cependant n'étaient pas convaincus, surtout parmi ceux qui n'étaient pas Frères Prècheurs et beaucoup se scandalisaient."—"L'Analogie de Proportion chez St. Thomas d'Aquin", in *Revue Néo-Scolastique de Philosophie,* Aug., 1922. Dr. B. Landry has also given us an interesting study on Duns Scotus, bearing the caption, *La Philosophie de Duns Scot* (Paris, Didot). In this essay he arrives at rather startling conclusions which are bound to shock the sensibilities of the admirers of the great Franciscan philosopher. He claims that the Doctor Subtilis stresses unduly the authority of God over His creatures, reducing them in His hands to mere metaphysical atoms. For reason there is no place in such a scheme of things, ruled only by external authority. Truth becoming a matter of arbitrary decision, the only consistent attitude of man would be agnosticism or scepticism. Social stagnation would have inevitably followed, for every progress would have been regarded as contrary to the will of God. The author then suggests that a civilization built upon these very principles, advocated by Duns Scotus, actually exists: it is the Mohammedan world. The fatalism of Islam is the exact counterpart of Duns Scotus's voluntarism. After

A Japanese Pragmatist. Besides other dubious blessings of Western civilization pragmatism also seems to have found its way to the Orient; for the world view expounded in a volume lately published by a professor at the University of Tokyo closely resembles this philosophical variety.[13] Its orientation is biological; that is, both its epistemology and its ethics are subordinated to the interests of life. Self-realization must be the aim of man; but the self meant in this connexion is not the narrow ego, but rather an ego with social connotations. Pride is invested with a special moral dignity. It is the ferment of all progress. Of course, the pride here spoken of is not what we ordinarily understand by the term. It is defined for us in the following way: "But our pride, in order to be a true one, has to draw its whole strength from nothing less than the divine assertion of the cosmic self." And again: "I am no atheist, as no one can really be. I believe in God in both the ways which are at bottom one; first I believe in the God that I ought to become. Finally it is we who give or deprive God

this we are not surprised at the final phrase: "Les civilisations occidentales doivent se féliciter, croyons-nous, que l'eglise romaine, si puissante au moyen âge, n'ait pas pris Jean Duns Scot pour philosophe officiel" (p. 355). To Fr. Parthenius Minges, O.F.M., Duns Scotus naturally appears in a more favorable light. Fairness demands that he be given an opportunity to set forth his view. It reads as follows: "Aquinas composuit Summam Theologicam harmonice et systematice in ordinem lucidum redactum. Cogitationes ab eo prolatae saepe minus bonae, certe minus originales sunt quam cogitationes et ideae Scoti. Sed hic non elaboravit similem Summam; prae sexcentis distinctionibus, objectionibus, argumentisque non raro obliviscitur addere, quid ipse velit. Eatenus Aquinatem nunquam aequabit. Haec bona et utilis dispositio et redactio exterior mihi videtur ultima ratio, quare ecclesia systema Aquinatis praetulerit et tantis laudibus commendaverit. Forma ejus externa est melior, materia interior autem saepissime minus laudanda esse videtur. Sed ultimatim non formae, sed materiae et res constituunt veritatem et capiunt mentes. Quare saltem mihi persuasum est, Scotum de futuro recuperaturum esse antiquum splendorem."—*Joannes Duns Scotus.* A Digest of Scotistic Doctrines; Cincinnati, Franciscan Educational Conference. The originality and the constructive ability of St. Thomas have recently been disputed by another author, who denies that the philosophical system which he has left can be called an organic synthesis. Thus P. Duhem, *Le système du monde; Histoire des doctrines cosmologiques de Platon à Copernic;* Paris, Hermann, 1917. In his estimation, St. Thomas has only achieved a mosaic of which we can trace each component part to its source. He states his view in these blunt terms: "Le Thomisme n'est donc pas une doctrine philosophique; il est une aspiration et une tendance; il n'est pas une synthèse, mais un désir de synthèse" (vol. 5, p. 569). This opinion has been vehemently contradicted by scholars of the highest distinction. De Wulf characterizes it as a "jugement sévère et insoutenable".

[13] Kojiro Sugimori, *The Principles of the Moral Empire;* London, The University Press. The Moral Empire, as may readily be suspected, is a human society that rises superior to racial differences and economic quarrels and that works together harmoniously for the realization of a better mode of human life.

of existence. The point is, therefore, that we must give the most perfect existence to God by making as much as possible of ourselves. Here lies the metaphysic of Pride." We doubt that such a philosophy will be very potent in lifting a people to a high moral level.

Contemporary Psychology. Psychology is the most popular study of our days. We might say with much justification that we are living in a psychological age. This in itself would be something to rejoice over, were it not that the psychology of to-day has severed its moorings from metaphysics and is drifting without orientation on a vast sea of aimless experimentation with no definite goal in sight. This, of course, is in perfect accord with the general trend of modern thought, but it is fatal for a right interpretation of psychical phenomena. Under the hands of modern experimenters and investigators psychology is becoming an exact science, but is ceasing to be a philosophy.[14] Though the field of psychology in this manner has been very much narrowed, there are those who advocate still further restriction of its sphere and a still more rigid abstention from rational explanation of the facts observed.[15]

[14] Professor B. H. Bode writes: "In the field of psychology the past two decades have been a period of upheaval. . . . Instead of one universal creed, there are now at least three rival standpoints, each of which claims to have the truth in its keeping. . . . Eventually the dissatisfaction with its procedure bore fruit in the movement or doctrine commonly known as behaviorism. This doctrine forms a clean-cut contrast with the psychology of mental states. It refuses to have any dealings with mental states. The subject matter of psychology, as it maintains, is not states of consciousness, but behavior. . . . We cannot go back to the traditional standpoint with its dry rot of antiquated metaphysics."—"What is Psychology?", in *Psychological Review,* July, 1922. Of behaviorism Dr. W. B. Pillsbury says: "The history of behaviorism shows that it is the legitimate and direct descendant of materialism."—"Suggestions for a Compromise of Existing Controversies in Psychology", in the same Review.

[15] Such a further division is advocated by Professor Samuel W. Fernberger: "We advocate, then, the separation of the present psychological discipline into two distinct and independent sciences. This splitting of the present-day psychology into two distinct sciences is not new in the history of thought. Take the case of chemistry, for example. . . . The older psychology emerges, thus, as a form of speculative procedure attempting to correlate the data of these two independent sciences with each other and with the data of physiology."—"Behavior versus Introspective Psychology", in *The Psych. Review,* Nov., 1922. The sad degradation of psychology is also reflected in the following passage: "Psychology began in the field of consciousness as mental philosophy. In general it has gravitated toward the positive methods of science. To at least one school it has gravitated entirely outside consciousness into bodily behavior. . . . Distinctively human behavior is the adaptive use of a vocal sign system known as language." — Prof. J. A. Melrose, "The Crux of the Psychological Problem", in *Psych. Review,* March, 1922. The Scholastic division of psychology into two branches, rational and experimental, sufficiently provides for all the exigencies of the case.

One reviewer regards it as a distinct disadvantage that consciousness is so much as alluded to in a definition of psychology.[16] Truly, psychology has fallen on lean days. Others merge the psychological in the social. Thus Miss Calkins asserts: "Everything psychological has a social significance."

Happily, a reaction against this narrow conception of psychology is forming which prepares the way for a return to saner methods.[17]

Here is a partial list of books on psychology that have recently been published: S. Smith and E. R. Guthrie, *General Psychology in Terms of Behavior* (New York, Appleton, 1921); R. S. Woodsworth, *Psychology. A Study of Mental Life* (New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1921); E. K. Strong, *Introductory Psychology for Teachers* (Baltimore, Warwick & York, 1920); R. Warcollier, *La Telepathie* (Paris, Felix Alcan, 1921); J. S. Moore, *The Foundations of Psychology* (Princeton, 1921); L. Lévy-Bruhl, *La Mentalité Primitive* (Paris, Alcan, 1922); J. Geyser, *Abriss der Allgemeinen*

[16] Thus Professor Max F. Meyer: "To the reviewer it appears a matter of great regret that Woodworth in this text book, which will undoubtedly have a great influence on the growing generation of psychologists in this country, did not succeed in freeing his definition from all reference to the conscious."—*Psychological Bulletin,* Aug., 1922.

[17] Thus Professor Arthur O. Lovejoy boldly states: "Behaviorism, in short, belongs to that class of theories which become absurd as soon as they become articulate. 'The Paradox of the Thinking Behaviorist' deserves to take its place in the logic books beside that of Epiminides the Cretan, to which it is closely related."—"The Paradox of the Thinking Behaviorist", in *The Philosophical Review,* March, 1922. Similarly Professor A. A. Roback: "The behavioristic hypothesis or assumption is a stagnant affair in that it usually promises a great deal and balks at the crucial point. We expect a mental experience to be translated into behavioristic components and are disappointed on learning that the experience reduces to the phrase, a set of adjustments. Are we to discard the analysis of our experiences for the sake of arriving at colorless conjectures, or at commonplaces decked out in biological language?"—"Intelligence and Bahavior", in *Psych. Review,* Jan., 1922. Dr. Joshua C. Gregory concludes an article in which he demolishes successfully the claims of the Behaviorists with this pregnant paragraph: "Animism, dreaming, and laughter witness against pure behaviorism. The behaviorist seeks the mental among the physical and, failing to find it, says there is only the latter. There is plenty of 'man in action' and the student of the 'course of action' in the 'mechanism of the body' can engross apprehension with 'pattern-reactions' till his eye becomes blind to the mental and the conscious. The remedy is a redirection of apprehension, and animism, dreaming and laughter insist on this redirection. . . . Simple experience refutes behaviorism — and animism, dreaming and laughter simply remind us, in a specially forcible way, of the refutation contained in it."—"Three Witnesses against Behaviorism", in *The Phil. Review,* Nov., 1922.

Psychologie (Muenster, Ferd. Schoeningh, 1922); J. Drever, *The Psychology of Everyday Life* (New York, E. P. Dutton & Co., 1921); H. H. Goddard, *Psychology of the Normal and the Subnormal* (New York, Dodd, Mead & Co., 1919); J. Lindworsky, S.J., *Experimentelle Psychologie* (Muenchen, Koesel & Pustet, 1921); same author, *Willensschule* (Paderborn, F. Schoeningh, 1922); R. Pauli, *Psychologisches Praktikum* (Jena, Gustav Fischer, 1919); H. E. Ziegler, *Tierpsychologie* (Berlin, Gruyter & Co., 1921); E. Wasmann, S.J., *Menschen und Tierseele* (Koeln, Bachem); J. Van Mollé, *Psychologie végétative* (Malines, Dierickx-Beke, 1918); J. U. Zoellner, *Curso de Psicologia*, para los Colegios de Enseñanza Secundaria (Buenos Aires, Angel Estrada y Ca.); G. Poyer, *Les problèmes généraux de l'hérédité psychologique* (Paris, F. Alcan, 1921); M. Larguier des Bancles, *Introduction à la Psychologie* (Paris, Payot); Bertrand Russell, *The Analysis of Mind* (New York, The Macmillan Co., 1921); G. S. Brett, *A History of Psychology* (Vol. iii, Modern Psychology, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1921); J. Sully, *My Life and Friends: A Psychologist's Memories* (New York, Dutton); Margaret Muensterberg, *Hugo Muensterberg: His Life and Work* (New York, Appleton, 1922); G. Dwelshauvers, *La Psychologie Française Contemporaine* (Paris, Alcan, 1920).

In France, as we are told in the last mentioned book, the movement toward a more comprehensive conception of psychological problems is well under way and has in many respects fertilized and enriched the study of psychology.[18] Materialism in psychology is doomed to barrenness. It finds closed doors on every side and gets nowhere. The more spiritual outlook of the French psychologist is of the greatest value even in the purely experimental field; it makes it possible for him to find unity in the bewildering maze of details and to distinguish the relevant, the important, the characteristic, the typical, where the eye of the observer, blind to the spiritual significance of things, sees merely a confused and unintelligible heap of meaningless facts. American psychology will benefit

[18] "Après avoir, pendant peu de temps, montré quelque tendance à se diviser, la psychologie, chez les plus éminents de ses représentants, redevint intégrale et synthétique, usant également des diverses méthodes dont elle dispose et ne négligeant aucun des aspects de la vie mentale" (p. 239).

enormously if it succeeds in casting off its materialistic obsession and if it adopts the spiritual approach of the French investigator; for it is the only key to the right appreciation of psychical phenomena.[19]

[19] Professor D. T. Howard, in reviewing the volume mentioned, admits the superiority of French psychology as far as horizon and penetration is concerned. "One of the most striking characteristics of modern French psychology", he writes, "would seem to be its great breadth of interest and variety of subject matter. There has, indeed, been a scientific movement in France, following the Leipzig agitation, which tended toward the narrowness and methodological limitation characteristic of our own attempts to establish psychology on a strictly scientific basis. This has been overcome. It is, to be sure, a truism to say that the more synthetic psychology becomes the more metaphysical its character. French psychology has never lost contact with philosophy. But in maintaining its breadth of interest it has not lost, but rather gained, explanatory power. This would not have been possible, of course, had it not possessed a central point of view to which all facts concerning the mental life of man—all facts—are relevant. There lies its unique distinction."—*The Phil. Review,* Jan., 1922, p. 96. The same book gives another reviewer the occasion to contrast French psychology with that of England and Germany. The comparison is very instructive and worth while transcribing. It reads: "The development of Psychology in France has been very distinctive, and contrasts sharply with that of England and Germany. It is more artistic, subtle, finished, and abounds in brilliant passages. It is less scientific than the German, deeper than the English, freer and less confined in grooves than either. It relies less on analytical introspection than on reflection and intuition. It is less interested in sensation than the German school, and gives more attention to emotion and will. It is broader in outlook, not satisfied with specialization on partial aspects, but interested in mind as a whole. It is more synthetic, more theoretically constructive, more philosophical. It is anti-Sensist, and even Rational. It favors vitalism rather than mechanism. It upholds personality and freedom of will. It is inclined to over-speculation and often has sympathies with a vague Pantheism. In two branches especially France has been a pioneer, the psychology of concrete types and collective Psychology."—J. Shine, in *Studies,* June, 1922, p. 323.

C. BRUEHL.

Overbrook Seminary.

Criticisms and Notes.

THE RETURN OF CHRISTENDOM. By a Group of Churchmen. With an Introduction by Bishop Gore and an Epilogue by G. K. Chesterton. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1922. Pp. 252.

UNITY AND ROME. By Edmund Smith Middleton, D.D. New York: The Macmillan Company. 1922. Pp. 269.

A CALL TO REUNION. By Viscount Halifax. London: Mowbray and Company. Pp. vii, 57.

THE CHURCHES OF ENGLAND. By One who has tried them. London: Sands and Company. Pp. 145.

The echoes of the cry for peace meet us everywhere on the national highways and in the camps of the Church militant. The voice is that of the soul forced to express its longing amid the agony of universal calamity, such as was foretold to be a signal of the end of things earthly. Christ had said: "You shall hear of wars and rumors of wars; nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom; and there shall be pestilences and famines and earthquakes. Now all these are the beginnings of sorrows. Many false prophets shall rise. And the gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world. And then shall the consummation come. He that readeth let him understand" (Matt. 24: 6-15).

If the priest feels himself to be the herald of the message of Christ it behooves him to heed the clamor, and to offer interpretation and help to the seekers of truth. To this end it is necessary that he not only sympathize but understand. Books like the above help us to get the viewpoint of our neighbor in the matter of the essential quality of union with Christ in His Church. That, under the social conditions of fallen mankind, a Church is necessary, and as such was established by the God Man, is admitted among thoughtful and sincere inquirers after religious truth. That the Roman Catholic Church is the historical and elemental outgrowth of that Church with its Apostolic foundation is equally clear to the serious student of history and of Christian civilization. What the outsider notes as irritating at times in the organic structure of historical Catholicism is the phenomenon common to all organic growth, namely the irregular branching out, from a common root and trunk, of the fruit-bearing limbs. He also notices the parasites that feed on the healthy life of the tree. These irregularities, these parasites in the Catholic Church, are the things that often keep the non-Catholic inquirer away from the Tree of Life. The average convert is shocked, dis-

edified, scandalized by the lack of enthusiasm, the want of reverence, the undervaluing and misapplication of the treasures within the Catholic Church. Unless he is wholly absorbed in the business of his own salvation for the time, he is tempted to say to himself what any searcher after the true God and His Church would have said in the days of Moses, if he had fixed his attention on the dancers round the golden calf, instead of watching the prophet on the mountain height: "This cannot be the true Church". But just as the imperfections in the form of a parasite-infested and moss-laden branch are no proof of its being dead, so long as it is part of the trunk and root, so also does the separation from the trunk indicate barrenness, despite the beauty of form. Timely engrafting or inoculation may restore the unity, but it must be done on the living ancient mother-tree. How far this can be applied to the churches seeking reunion with the ancient Church of Christ is the subject discussed in the above volumes.

The Return of Christendom, discussed in the volume introduced by the Anglican Bishop Charles Gore, is a return to the pre-Reformation ideals, which popular historians have a vicious habit of referring to as the "Dark Ages", as though the defection of Luther and Henry VIII with their ilk had been a step forward into the light. The writers of the present symposium agree on the wisdom of regarding the Middle Ages as a desirable starting-point from which to get back to true principles of the Christian socialism which the gospel of Peace offers. "It is from the nobler efforts of the Middle Ages", says one of these authors, "that we should seek to go forward." "In essentials", writes another, "the faithful of the Middle Ages, despite their failures in practice, possessed a rule of life and a sense of beauty which we are painfully endeavoring to recover." These are the sentiments of representative men who, looking out upon the chaos in our social and industrial world, plead for reconstruction on the humanizing plan offered by Christianity. They understand the destructive principles of the materialistic Marxian philosophy and repudiate it as a saving scheme; they feel the weakness of the Labor Movement with its lack of stability and its endless tendency to internal faction; they recognize the futile efforts of State legislation and paternalism to cope with the social, industrial and moral evils which secular education only refines into a tyranny of autocracy.

The one thing that stands out in these thoughtful and sincere expressions is their acceptance of a dogmatic basis in any organized society that claims for its mission the teaching of truth and the ordering of social life. The writers find this dogmatic foundation

not merely in the unity of faith that gave vitality to religious worship in pre-Reformation times, but also in the life of the secular brotherhoods which taught and practised the principles of justice, reverence, and love during the earlier centuries. Whilst showing differences of attitude toward Christ's Church as an institutional organism, these writers agree in their common appeal to religious-minded men outside the Roman Catholic Church and to the democracy in general for union on the basis of the Catholic faith abandoned by the so-called Reformers.

But the question inevitably rises in the mind of the reader: If you admit that the Medieval Church offers the solution of the social and moral problems of to-day, why not recognize the claims of the Roman Catholic Church which maintains the doctrines and practices of the Middle Ages in religious life? Men agree that Rome alone represents the Medieval Church. She is the only institution which maintains the apostolic tradition of the sacramental system. It is true that, as Mr. G. K. Chesterton who writes the concluding chapter of the volume, points out, the Catholic Church is constantly dying; but she is also constantly reviving, phœnix-like or Lazarus-like, to new life. Men have written her epitaph since the days of Diocletian and Julian, but she lives on.

The survival of Christianity in the medieval theory of social order, contrasted with the failure of individual and state socialism as harbingers of world peace, forms the chief topic of the *Return of Christendom*. The writers recognize the Roman Catholic Church in the main as the legitimate guardian of the deposit of Christ's teaching and sacramental trust during the past ages. They suggest, if they do not advocate, union with the ancient Church. But they ignore her supreme and absolute title as the one Church of Christ, the exclusive dispenser of the fruits of the Redemption. The old theory that the Roman Church has erred, defected, or exceeded her legitimate exercise of inherited claims, and therefore forfeited the prerogatives of Mother of all the Churches, is in their mind subordinate to the claim that Anglicanism at least has a true apostolic title to dispense the word of Christ and the sacramental graces of an institutional Church bearing His name.

Such is the distinctive assumption of Viscount Halifax. He will concede all that Rome claims; but he will reserve the title of true descent if not of equal age and precedence for the Church of England. He pleads for union, not merely as a policy which offers a solution of pressing problems, but as the will of Christ when He said, " Father, I pray that they may be one, as we are One ".

But the crux of the discussion lies not in the noble aspiration for Unity but rather in the way and means to this end. And here Dr.

Middleton offers a further suggestion in his volume entitled *Unity and Rome,* by approaching the question in the sense of the Nicene Creed: "I believe in one, Catholic and Apostolic Church". The one, Catholic, Apostolic Church must of course have a head. That Canterbury, whose Archbishop presided at the Lambeth Conference, is this head, will hardly be maintained by any serious-minded person, however devoted to the Anglican prerogatives. Canterbury has no authority over Christendom as a whole. Where then is the Centre and Source of the Unity to be brought about? The one See that has ever made this claim is Rome, the See of Peter, to whom Christ gave the keys of heaven. Rome has no rival in its primacy. Thus far Dr. Middleton's argument; whence he urges the conclusion that Rome must of necessity be drawn into any plan of Unity that is really such. If the Roman Pontiff of to-day will not recognize the claims of the Episcopalian and Anglican or other allied communions to being true children of the successor of Peter, to be cared for by the Vicar of Christ, the fault is his. It is a lack of vision that does not rest upon infallibility. Therefore a new pope may alter the position of Rome and depart from the policy of Leo XIII, Pius X, Benedict XV. Meanwhile Dr. Middleton bids his brethren to accept the facts of history, the undoubted possession of the Petrine rights and traditions. Hence follows the necessity of conformity and a return to the ancient ritual and the doctrinal forms of the Roman Church which were partly abandoned in the religious conflicts of the sixteenth century. The author is equally assured of the validity of priestly and episcopal ordination in the Anglican Church. He essays the demonstration that in all essentials the ordination or consecration of Matthew Parker, the first archbishop of Canterbury after the death of Cardinal Pole, was a valid apostolic act whereby the succession of a legitimate priesthood and the administration of valid sacraments is secured for the Anglican Church. He cites Catholic testimony, albeit with his own interpretation, which Catholic apologists, in view of the solemn declaration of Leo XIII in 1896, are apt however to question. Lord Halifax was the man who provoked that solemn declaration from the Sovereign Pontiff directly, after an appointed Commission had made a most careful examination of the historical facts accessible at the time.

What effect that declaration and the tests applied in practice by anyone anxious to live as an Anglican, but to die as a Catholic, have brought, after trying the various churches of England claiming communion with Rome or at least a possession of its sacramental powers, is shown in *The Churches of England — by One who has tried them.* Whatever reasoning one may apply to the vexed questions involved in the Anglican ordinations it is plain that assured safety is to be found in Rome alone.

INDIAN AND WHITE IN THE NORTHWEST. A History of Catholicity in Montana, 1831-1891. By L. B. Palladino, S.J. Introduction by the Right Rev. John B. Brondel, D.D. (Second edition, completely revised and enlarged.) Wickersham Publishing Co., Lancaster, Pa. 1922. (Pp. xx—512.)

Embossed on the cover of this stately and handsome octavo are symbols that recall the beginnings both of religion and of civilization in the Northwest. Below is the outline of a stockade flanked by a few wigwams. Within the palisade are a cross-crowned chapel and a few small service buildings. Above are entablatured the title of the book and the Great Seal of the State of Montana. In the background are massed the green forest and the brown flanks of rising mountains, whose serrated summits are capped with snow. The symbolism is obvious. It represents the first Christian mission, St. Mary's, planted by the intrepid apostle De Smet, amongst the Flat Head Indians, in the Bitter Root Valley between the foothills of the Rocky Mountains within the present State of Montana. The Great Seal of the Commonwealth might almost seem to offer an official testimony to the historic fact that from the humble mission Chapel went forth the beginnings alike of Christianity and of civil progress in the State, which for magnitude and still more for natural resources ranks third within our national federation.

The story of how the faith was brought to the Flat Heads is redolent of romance whose beauty is unsurpassed by any other idyl of history. In the early years of the nineteenth century a band of Iroquois, descendants of those fiercest of savages whom the blood of the martyred Jogues had won for Christ, left their happy village, Kanawauga, near the rapids of the St. Lawrence, and turned their faces toward the setting sun. Urged by they knew not what impulse, they moved forward, nor settled to permanent rest until they had reached the foothills of the far-away Montanian Rockies. Here they were hospitably welcomed by the Selish Indians, commonly, though wrongly, called Flat Heads. Settling and commingling with their hosts they taught them the sign of the cross and other Catholic devotions and truths, and told these Western Indians of the Black Robes in the distant East, who said the Great Prayer (the Mass), took away the burden of sin from the erring, gave to the Red Man equally with the Pale Face the Great Spirit who tabernacled with them in the house of prayer.

These heavenly tidings awakened in their hearers a great longing to have the Black Robes come and tell them more about the Great Spirit. So they sent four of the tribe to the big village of the Pale Face, called St. Louis. Faring forth in the spring of 1831, these

seekers for the light journeyed over many hundreds of miles, across rough mountains and torrentuous streams, over deserts and almost trackless prairies, through regions infested by fierce beasts and by far fiercer savage enemies, until in October they reached the white man's home by the Father of Rivers. Here two of their number died from exhaustion, but not before their souls had been cleansed with baptismal water and fortified by the Divine Viaticum for their last journey, and their bodies annealed with the saving unction. The other two returned home bearing with them the joyful promise that the Black Robes would be sent to their people.

It took three more similar embassies before the promise was to be redeemed. At length Fr. de Smet could be spared for the great undertaking. He arrived at the home of the Flat Heads and founded St. Mary's in 1841. From it branched out other missions, until the vast territory became dotted here and there with foundations whereat the Indians were instructed at once in the truths and practices of the Catholic religion and in the agricultural and industrial arts. In each of these succursal missions boarding schools were eventually established, in which, removed from the environment of savagery and yet not isolated from parents and kindred, the Indian youths were trained to moral living and to the refinement of civilized life. The reaction of the youth thus trained upon their kindred at the missions and their intermarriage led to the development of those centres which became shrines of religious devotedness and hives of busy industry that were hardly surpassed in either element by the far-famed Jesuit Reductions of Paraguay or the no less marvelous Franciscan *concentrados* of California. Would that the whites bringing with them their vices more than their virtues had not come into close relation with the Indian missions! Would too that the mercenary Indian agents and other higher officials of the government had not robbed the Red Man of his lands, stolen his cattle, cheated him out of his rations! These missions might have flourished into still more efficient organs of religion and true civilization. The Western march of the whites' progress, however, is not to be stopped by the Indians' chapel, his teeming crops, or his buzzing mills. There is gold in his streams, and his land is fat. He must yield to the greed of his pale-faced brother. He must vacate his lands and move to the Reservation to which he is assigned by the Great Father at Washington. The same paternal government that despoils him of his property will henceforth feed him on rations, clothe him with ready-made suits, send his children to school whether to the public school or, happily, to the Contract Schools of the Missions.

In the volume before us the history of all this is set down with every mark of honesty and justice. The establishment and develop-

ment of the several Missions, the foundation of the Indian Schools, the treatment of the Indians by the whites, private and official—the main events in those stages of Montanian history have been gathered by Fr. Palladino largely from his own personal experience, supplemented by the oral and written narratives of his fellow missionaries and other immediate witnesses.

It is a story as charming as it is instructive and edifying and inspiring. Written with the greatest simplicity, it convinces the reader by its open-faced candor, while it holds his attention with its vivid description of scenery, thrills him with incidents of heroic venture, and beguiles him with many an anecdote wherein the grave and the playful are closely aligned. It is a book which the clergy and religious will most highly appreciate. At the same time it is one which should be read widely by the laity whose faith the examples of sacrifice made by the Indian neophytes in order to receive and utilize the blessings brought to them by the missionaries, cannot fail to confirm. The book indeed, though primarily a contribution to the history of religion and civilization, is hardly less an argument for the divinity of the Catholic Church.

BIBLIORUM SACRORUM JUXTA VULGATAM CLEMENTINAM NOVA EDITIO, Breviario Perpetuo et Concordantiis aucta, adnotatis etiam locis qui in monumentis Fidei solemnioribus et in Liturgia Romana usurpari consueverunt. Curavit Aloisius Gramatica, Bibliothecae Ambrosianae Praefectus. Taurini: Petri Marietti editoris sumptibus. 1922. Pp. 1152.

The prefect of the Ambrosian Library at Milan, successor to the present Sovereign Pontiff, has compiled this Latin Bible, which is a marvel of industry and erudition. At first sight it appears to be merely a succinct edition of the Clementine Vulgate, with current marginal notes explanatory of the text. On closer examination it proves to be a carefully and consistently corrected translation in which all the verbal irregularities of the authorized Vulgate are eliminated. This, with critical attention to the punctuation, and to the poetic alignment in the didactic portions, gives us a practically perfect text of the authorized Tridentine Bible.

But of far greater service for the Catholic reader of the sacred volume is the apparatus elucidating and interpreting the Latin text which the theologian is bound to use in his demonstrations of the truths of Faith, and to which the preacher and catechist must conform for the sake of unity and clearness. The typographical arrangement of the matter allows a space of three lines at the top of each page for a brief descriptive exposition of the contents of the

section below. Here parallel passages are indicated. Next we have marginal notes referring to the concordant passages, distinctly stating whether they are literal, or merely give the same sense, or serve as types, allegories and figures; or suggesting that the parallelism or concordance is merely assumed, as in the case of the Protestant versions seeking to justify by Bible quotations their favorite interpretations dissenting from Catholic doctrine.

Distinct from these concordance references in the margin are the indications of the liturgical use that has been made of current passages in the Breviary, Missal, Ritual, and Pontifical. The doctrinal passages are located by reference to the *Catechismus Romanus* as the standard text book of interpretation in all matters of Christian Faith. It is apparent at once what an amount of careful labor all these references have involved, and to what wide practical uses they lend themselves for the teacher of Christian doctrine who wishes to make the text of the Bible the foundation of his instructions. One cannot help regretting that the very small type and the crowding of the notes into a narrow space by the side of the pages makes it somewhat difficult, not only to find the passages immediately and with ease, but to realize the immense value of the help otherwise afforded by the volume. To anyone who can take the time and trouble to expand the matter, Dr. Gramatica's edition offers a rich treasury for the study of religion through the Bible. The careful student may seize on the material here collated and expand it for practical purposes.

THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST. A Novena of Devotions in Honour of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. By the Most Rev. Patrick Phelan, D.D., Bishop of Sale. Melbourne: William P. Linehan. Pp. 119.

These nine sermons are a call for a National Act of Faith on the part of the Catholics of Australia and New Zealand, after these countries had been solemnly consecrated to the Sacred Heart in 1919. The Bishop gives his reason for choosing the Priesthood as his theme. "In nearly every town there are several churches which to the youthful mind present a like importance." But there can be but one Church of Jesus Christ, perpetuating the doctrine, the sacrifice and the priesthood of Christ. "The only denomination in this country claiming a Priesthood is the Anglican Communion. In a few churches of this Communion desperate efforts are made in the way of processions, Benediction, Mass, and Confessions, to impress the congregations that they are ministered to by priests. We have deep sympathy with those excellent people and exemplary pastors, but truth and charity compel us to state that in this country there is

no priesthood except in the Church governed from the Chair of Peter." With a view of popularizing this distinction the writer develops his subject, beginning with the source of priestly love in the Sacred Heart. He next explains the functions of Christ's sharers in His priesthood for the purpose of canceling sin and bringing the fruits of the Redemption to the individual soul through sacramental channels having their centre in the Mass and the Blessed Eucharist. It is a practical presentation of the priestly office in its appeal to the general public.

THE SACRISTAN'S HANDBOOK. A Practical Guide for Sacristans. By Bernard Page, S.J., author of "A Practical Guide for Servers at Low Mass", etc. New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Brothers. 1922. Pp. 192.

The right use of this excellent little manual is for the priest in the first place. It serves the sacristans for reference, but should be read by the priest and pastor, with a view to systematically instructing the local sacristan and inducting him to the orderly performance of his office. We prefer to employ as engineers or as chauffeurs young men of intelligent and clean habits who have a knowledge of mechanics belonging to their engine. It is much more important to have a well instructed and trained sacristan in our churches. The matter is of wide influence and deep. Anyone who on weekdays or even during times of worship in the church has seen a sexton in shirt-sleeves, or a slatternly housekeeper fussing irreverently about the altar, will make up his mind at once about the priest of that church. Charity may excuse the pseudo-sacristan, or the pastor who has no appreciation of his dignity, but the disgust aroused by such conduct lowers our estimate of both. Use this manual and make your sexton live in the presence of the King of Kings. The rest will come of itself—a better people, and growth of the blessings that are hoped for through the priesthood.

Literary Chat.

Mgr. Doucet, Vicar General of the diocese of Chatham, Canada, has written a really beautiful poem on the Blessed Sacrament under the title *Emmanuel — the Living Bread.* The rhythmic presentation of the dogmatic content of our act of faith in the Blessed Eucharist takes the form of a prayer which is calculated to add fervor to a priest's thanksgiving for being made the guardian of the tabernacle in our churches. The eight-page series of verses is supplemented by a goodly number of quotations from the Sacred Scriptures and the writings of the Christian Fathers which lend additional value to the reflections called forth by the prayer.

A pleasing selection of *Verses for Various Occasions* is issued by Mary Christina Austin, editor of "North American Teacher". The little volume, which is illustrated with sketches by Harriet O'Brien, appeals to the teachers of our various religious orders. (Boston: The N. A. T. Publishing Company.)

In this connexion we may also mention *Cloister Chords* by Sr. M. Fides Shepperson of the Mt. Mercy Academy, Pittsburgh, which, though not in verse, echo the poetic melody of a reflecting Christian mind, and offer incentives to meditation.

The Benziger Brothers have done a notable service to pastors and teachers in our schools by issuing a popular and handy edition of Alban Butler's *Lives of the Saints*, with brief reflections for every day of the year. Besides this they print in attractive picture covers the separate *Patron Saints for Catholic Youth*—St. Joseph, St. Helen, St. Aloysius, St. Bridget, St. Anthony, and others of well-known names; also *Illustrated Lives* of the same for readers small and grown. Example draws, especially in storied form when we cannot have the living presence. What a wave of virtuous endeavor a priest could set going if, with each Baptism administered in his parish, he were to give the sponsor or parent one of these simple pictures of the patron saint of the newly Christianized child; or at Confirmation or first Communion!

The *Practical Prayer Book* for Catholics of America (D. B. Hansen and Sons, Chicago) is an intelligent answer for the demand long felt amongst us for a common book of prayer. In contents and form alike, it is greatly superior to the Prayer Book of the Council of Baltimore which was meant to answer the same demand. Here we have instruction going hand in hand with devotion, both covering the daily needs of the Christian life, and allowing for the various avocations, dispositions of mind, and devotional opportunities. We are often told by outsiders that Catholics practise devotionally what they do not understand and cannot explain. Here is the answer by a silent priest who has evidently had experience in directing and instructing. Pastors will find help in this little prayer book toward training their people to a right appreciation of the Mass and other worship of the ecclesiastical year, and to meditating on the same.

It is not improbable that at least many if not most of those who have read *The Wonderful Crucifix of Limpias* (Spain), by the Rev. Baron von Kleist, which was recently reviewed in these pages, were convinced by the mass of evidence accumulated in the volume that the phenomena of the Santo Cristo are, to say the least, of a preternatural nature. Not so with Fr. Thurston. For him the evidence is inadequate. In a characteristically critical paper on the subject in the December *Studies* he confesses that his "dominant impression" is that "the phenomena are not supernatural", although the visions perceived are not due in every case to the same causes. The more usual phenomena, he thinks with Dr. Cercas, can be explained in large measure by the variations in the electric current which affect the arc lamps throwing light upon the figure of the Crucified.

Now, as Fr. von Kleist takes note in dealing with Dr. Cercas' hypothesis, in the earlier period of the apparitions the electric light was not there; and people had seen them by daylight. Moreover, since the electric light was installed—and that precisely in order that the sacred figure might be so illuminated as to prevent any possible illusion—the phenomena are seen to be independent of the arc light; because the latter is switched off at noon: at which hour very many appearances are observed and "the breathing and the flowing of blood show in the same way as at the times when the electric light is burning". Besides, these appearances do not vary with the variations of the current, as they should have to do if they were dependent on the latter.

Fr. Thurston thinks that psychical conditions may also help to explain the phenomena. "Among the crowds who have visited Limpias some individuals will almost certainly have

possessed a latent faculty, akin to that of 'scryer', of seeing hallucinatory pictures, and no experiments which have yet been undertaken provide any means of estimating in what degree the visual perceptions of these favored few may exercise a telepathic influence upon others who surround them". This appeal to "scrying" (crystal-gazing) as a possible analogue to the Limpias experience does not seem to carry much weight, and even when conjoined with possible telepathic influences does not appear to be very effective. The visions at Limpias are not conditioned by the fixed stare of the "scryer". They come just as often unlooked-for when the gazer lends nothing to the process, but suddenly receives passively the vision. Moreover, while telepathic projection or reception might possibly account for an individual experience, in the vast majority of visions, which are so varied in the adjuncts — in many of which crowd-hallucinations are excluded—it is hard to find any room for telepathy. Finally, he says, "the fact always remains that the immense majority of those who visit Limpias, however much they may be impressed by the devotional atmosphere of the place, see nothing at all". Upon which it may be observed that it was only Saul who was supernaturally affected on the way to Damascus. Stephen alone beheld the heavens open and Jesus standing at the right-hand of God. Bernadette alone amongst the throng of bystanders heard the voice and saw the White Lady over the grotto of Massabielle.

Whether the mysterious occurrences at Limpias are of natural origin or not, Fr. Thurston has not discovered the cause of them yet. On the other hand, it is good to see his critical powers engaged in the quest. The tendency to excessive credulity in such matters is very general and it is well that it should be counterbalanced by a critic as discriminating as the eminent Jesuit savant.

Few pilgrims to Lourdes, if they linger for a while at the favored village, fail to make a lesser pilgrimage to Betharram, the little village that clings close to the Cave farther down amongst the foothills of the Pyrennees. Here centuries before Notre Dame de Lourdes appeared to Bernadette at the grotto of Massabielle there had been a shrine favored by Our Lady of Betharram. And the life-sized Stations of the Cross along the picturesque path on the side of the mountain back of the village attest the devotional life which, though once more peopled from afar, is still fervent amongst the simple inhabitants.

In this little village was born of humble parentage in 1797 Michel Garricoits, who subsequently became a priest, a professor, a superior of the seminary, and the founder of the Institute of the Priests of the Sacred Heart of Jesus (of Betharram). Remarkable for sanctity, he was declared Venerable and his Life was written by P. Basilide Bourdenne, the third edition having appeared in a volume of 600 pages, issued by Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris, in 1918. Steps toward his canonization are now in progress and his beatification is to take place next May. In the meantime a priest of his Institute, P. Jean Fargues, S.C.J., has compiled a small volume (pp. 254), which is published at Tarbes (Imprimerie Lesbordes) entitled *Le Vénérable Garicoits—Sa Vie —Ses Vertus—Ses Miracles.* Derived chiefly from the large *Life* by Bourdenne, it makes no claim to be a full biography but rather a character sketch, as is indicated by the subtitle. It is an edifying and instructive story, told in an interesting style. The book is illustrated by a number of photographs and equipped with unusually full indexes.

Apart from the individual gratification and what might be called the social or communal increment resulting from such occurrences, the commemoration of notable historical events, such as the jubilee of a diocese or that of its Ordinary, gives occasion to the creation of an historical conspectus which possesses a value not only for the clergy and faithful directly or indirectly participant in the event, but also for the Church at large. On 12 October, 1921, the Diocese of Scranton commemorated the twenty-fifth anniversary of the consecration of its Bishop, the Right Rev. M. J. Hoban, and the fiftieth anni-

versary of the erection of the see itself. The event was indeed a double jubilee in which the faithful united with the clergy and their guests in a splendidly worthy celebration of the unique synchronism — a celebration wherein the general joy and congratulations found expression not only in befitting ceremonial and social union but in a handsome testimonial which was devoted to certain needed work of religion and beneficence.

The double celebration gave occasion and stimulus to the compilation by the executive committee of a commemorative volume which has recently been published under the title *Souvenir of Dual Jubilee* (International Textbook Press, Scranton, Pa). The book is a neat octavo worthy of the occasion both in its make-up (notably in its many fine photo-engravings) and its collection of historical contents. Besides recording in detail the events of the celebration, the volume contains a sketch of Bishop Hoban's life, a succinct history of the Scranton Diocese, a survey of its works of charity, and a brief account of each of the religious communities working under the Bishop's administration. The Scranton clergy and particularly their representative committee deserve the congratulations of their brethren everywhere for having compiled this permanent memorial of fifty years of diocesan life.

The second part of the two years' course of religious instruction which the Coadjutor Archbishop of Sydney, the Most Rev. M. Sheehan, D.D., prepared for schools and colleges, has recently been issued by Gill & Son, Dublin. The first part treated of *Apologetics*. The second explains *Catholic Doctrine*. The two volumes bearing the conjoined title constitute a remarkably solid and timely compend of the rational foundations and the superstructure of Catholic Faith. The learning, precision, and distinction of expression which one has been taught to associate with a writer who holds or has held a professorship at Maynooth, are stamped on every page of this exposition of Catholic doctrine. Archbishop Sheehan realizes that the Catholic youth of to-day needs to be informed on the problems wherein the truths of revelation come into relation with the findings and the hypotheses of the natural sciences. He therefore sets forth succinctly, for instance, the substance of evolutionism in the light of Catholic teaching.

In such a matter his judgment is as in all others prudent as well as solid. Thus, as regards the origin of man, he holds that the doctrine that the body of the first man was evolved, while "opposed to the all but unanimous teaching of Fathers and theologians", has not been "officially condemned by the Church" (p. 51). And therefore if to-morrow the proof were produced that "the body of the first man was evolved from the lower animals it would not be found to contradict any solemn, ordinary or official teaching of the Church" (p. 54). In this connexion we might note a slight inaccuracy in the expression that "the body of Adam was created directly by God" (p. 55). Obviously "produced", not "created", is the *verbum sanum* in this relation.

Needless to say, the computation of 4000 years which still disfigures some of our Catechisms of Perseverance and Bible Histories finds no place in Dr. Sheehan's manual. Nobody knows the age of the human race and the Church has never given any decision in the matter. Our religious teachers would be helped by this little handbook.

There seems to be a growing revival of interest in the work of St. Bernardine of Sienna, second only to that which has been accorded to his compatriot, Catherine, and his Franciscan predecessor, the *Poverello* of Assisi. The impress produced on his age by Bernardine was wrought by his preaching, which seems to have captured every grade of society and every walk of life. The *Lent* of 1427 preached by the Saint on the *del Campo* of Sienna are types of his fervent, soul-stirring eloquence. They were taken down by one of the audience, Benedetto di Maestro Bartolomeo. The MS. preserved in the library of Sienna was published in 1840 by Luciano Banchi, in three volumes. From these an excerpt has been made, or rather edited and trans-

lated into French, by M. François Benedict. This has just been published in a neat little volume (pp. 256) by Perrin & Cie., Paris, with the title *Saint Bernardin de Sienne: Enseignements et Apologues.*

Under the title *A Simple Life of Jesus* a Sister of Notre Dame, who has previously given us several booklets helpful for the education of children, has written the story of Our Lord's Life. The *motif* is the Divinity of the God-man. This controls the narrative as it moves from Bethlehem to the Mount of the Ascension. The story is told so naturally and beautifully that in the hands of a sympathetic reader—mother or teacher—it can easily take the place of the spoken narrative. The booklet (pp. 88) is neatly printed, and with its well-chosen illustrations has a Christmas appearance. (Sands & Co., London; B. Herder, St. Louis, Mo.)

The *Catholic Art Calendar* issued by the Extension Press (Chicago) is a thing of beauty. It will be a joy for every day of 1923. It will inform, enlighten, admonish through its daily suggestions and its summary of doctrinal and liturgical instruction. Hung on the wall in a Catholic home, it will educate and inspire.

Books Received

SCRIPTURAL.

LES SYMBOLES DE L'ANCIEN TESTAMENT. Par D. Buzy, des Prêtres du S.-C. de Jésus (de Bétharram), Docteur ès Sciences Bibliques. J. Gabalda, Paris. 1923. Pp. vi—423. Prix, 8 *fr.* 50 *net.*

BIBLIORUM SACRORUM juxta Vulgatam Clementinam Nova Editio Breviario Perpetuo et Concordantiis Aucta adnotatis etiam locis qui in monumentis fidei sollemnioribus et in liturgia Romana usurpari consueverunt. Curavit Aloisius Gramatica, Bibliothecae Ambrosianae Praefectus. Petrus Marietti, Taurini, Italia. 1922. Pp. xvi—1175. Pretium, 40 *Lib. It.*

LES PRÉDICTIONS DE L'APOCALYPSE. Par Marc Dal Madico. P. Lethielleux, Paris. 1922. Pp. 48. Prix, 2 *fr.* 30 *franco.*

THEOLOGICAL AND DEVOTIONAL.

MEDITATION MANUAL FOR EACH DAY OF THE YEAR. From the Italian of a Father of the Society of Jesus. Adapted for Ecclesiastics, Religious and Others. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis; Manresa Press, London. 1922. Pp. 778. Price, $1.25.

TRACTATUS DE DEO CREATORE ET DE NOVISSIMIS. Auctore Joanne Muncunill. e Societate Jesu. Typis Librariae Religiosae, in Via Aviñó 20, Barcinone. 1922. Pp. xvi—711.

EPITOME THEOLOGIAE MORALIS P. Ioannis B. Ferreres, S.I., Codicis Canonici Praescriptionibus, ac Subsequentibus Sanctae Sedis Declarationibus, Dispositionibus Iuris Hispani ac Lusitani, Decretis Concilii Plenarii Americae Latinae, necnon I. Conc. Prov. Manilani Earundemque Regionum Legibus Peculiaribus etiam Civilibus Accommodata. Editio quarta—tertia Latina. Eugenius Subirana, Barcinone. 1922. Pp. xxvi—646. Precio, 7 *pesetas.*

COMMENTARIUM TEXTUS CODICIS IURIS CANONICI. Liber III: De Rebus. Partes II—De locis et temporibus sacris; III—De cultu divino; IV—De magisterio ecclesiastico; V—De beneficiis aliisque institutis ecclesiasticis non collegialibus; VI—De bonis Ecclesiae temporalibus. Cum declarationibus authenticis usque ad diem 31 Octobris 1922 (A.A.S., XIV, Fasc. 15). Auctore Fr. Alberto Blat, O.P., Lect. S. Theol. ac Iuris Can. Doct. et Codicis Professore in Pontificio Collegio Internationali "Angelico". Ex Typographia Pontificia in

Instituto Pii IX, Romae. 1923. Pp. viii—607. Venui habentur Romae apud Auctorem, Via S. Vitale 15, 5; Franc. Ferrari, Via dei Cestari, 2; et alios Urbis Bibliopolas. Pretium extra Italiam intelligendum 24 *fr.*

LIVES OF THE SAINTS. With Reflections for Every Day in the Year. Compiled from the *Lives of the Saints* by the Rev. Alban Butler. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. Pp. 390. Price, $0.20; $18.00 a hundred.

THE PRACTICAL PRAYER BOOK. For the Catholics of America. Standard Prayers in fluent idiomatic English, with many explanations as to meanings and historic origin of various ceremonies and devotions, particularly in the Mass. D. B. Hansen & Sons, Chicago. 1922. Pp. 384. Price, $1.00.

THE LETTERS OF ST. TERESA. A Complete Edition, Translated from the Spanish and Annotated by the Benedictines of Stanbrook. With an Introduction by Cardinal Gasquet. Vol. III. Thomas Baker, London. 1922. Pp. vii—328. Price, 10/— *net.*

RETREAT CONFERENCES FOR RELIGIOUS. By the Right Rev. Bishop Cox, O.M.I., Vicar Apostolic of the Transvaal. Two volumes. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1922. Pp. viii—307 and viii—352. Price, $2.00 *net* each.

APOLOGETICS AND CATHOLIC DOCTRINE. A Two Years' Course of Religious Instruction for Schools and Colleges. By the Most Rev. M. Sheehan, D.D., Coadjutor Archbishop of Sydney, formerly of St. Patrick's College, Maynooth. Part II: Catholic Doctrine. M. H. Gill & Son, Dublin. 1922. Pp. viii—258. Price, 3/3 *postpaid.*

SAINT BERNARDIN DE SIENNE. Enseignements et Apologues. Traduits de l'Italien par François Benedict. Perrin & Cie, Paris. 1923. Pp. xxi — 256. Prix, 7 fr.

ST. IGNATIUS OF LOYOLA, Imitator of Christ, 1494 to 1555. By John Hungerford Pollen, S.J. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1922. Pp. x—167. Price, $1.60 *postpaid.*

THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST. A Novena of Devotions in Honor of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. By the Most Rev. Patrick Phelan, D.D., Bishop of Sale. Wm. P. Linehan, Melbourne, Australia. Pp. 119. Price, 2/6.

CATECHISM THEOLOGY. By J. B. McLaughlin, O.S.B., B.A., London. Longmans, Green & Co., London, New York, Toronto, Bombay, Calcutta and Madras. 1922. Pp. vii—115. Price, $1.25 *net.*

DE FORMULIS FACULTATUM S. C. DE PROPAGANDA FIDE COMMENTARIA. Arthurus Vermeersch, e S.I., Doctor Iuris et Iuris Canonici, Romae, in Pontificia Universitate Gregoriana S.I. Professor Theologiae Moralis. Ex Periodicis de re canonica et morali. Sumptibus Beyaert, Brugis; Eug. Subirana, Barcelonae; Deposito Libri Universita Gregoriana, Romae. 1922. Pp. 116.

A DAY'S RETREAT IN PREPARATION FOR HOLY COMMUNION. By Robert Eaton, Priest of the Birmingham Oratory. Sands & Co., London and Birmingham; B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis. 1922. Pp. 38. Price, $0.60.

PATRON SAINTS FOR CATHOLIC YOUTH: *St. Agnes, St. Aloysius, St. Anne, St. Anthony, St. Bernard, St. Bridget, St. Catherine, St. Cecilia, St. Charles, St. Elizabeth, St. Francis Xavier, St. Helena, St. Joseph, St. Margaret, St. Martin, St. Michael, St. Patrick, St. Philip, St. Rose of Lima, and St. Teresa.* By Mary E. Mannix. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. Pp. 24 each. Price, $0.10 each *postpaid;* assorted, $6.75 a hundred *net.*

DE IMITATIONE CHRISTI. Libri Quatuor. Editio 52ª Taurinensis accuratissime emendata. Petrus Marietti, Taurini, Italia. 1923. Pp. 377. Pretium, *Lib. It.* 4.

LA CONQUETE DES HOMMES. Par le R. P. F.-A. Vuillermet, O. P. P. Lethielleux, Paris. 1922. Pp. 362. Prix, 7 *fr.* 70 *franco.*

DE LOCIS ET TEMPORIBUS SACRIS. Codicis Iuris Canonici L. III, pars altera. Tractatus Theorico-Practicus, complectens titulos: De ecclesiis, De oratoriis, De altaribus, De sepultura ecclesiastica, De diebus festis, De abstinentia et ieiunio. P. Matthaeus a Coronata, O.M.C., Doctor et Lector Iuris Canonici. Petrus Marietti, Taurini, Italia. 1922. Pp. xix—340. Pretium, 14 *Lib. It.*

DOMINUS VOBISCUM. A Book of Letters. By the Right Rev. Msgr. Francis C. Kelley, D.D., LL.D. With a Preface by the Right Rev. Msgr. F. A. Purcell, D.D. Matre & Co., Chicago. 1922. Pp. 274. Price, $1.50 *postpaid.*

THE CONFESSIONS OF VENERABLE FATHER AUGUSTINE BAKER, O.S.B. Extracted from a Manuscript Treatise preserved in the Library of Ampleforth Abbey, and edited by Dom Justin McCann, Monk of Ampleforth. Benziger Bros., New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1922. Pp. 150. Price, $1.25 *net.*

PHILOSOPHICAL.

GENERAL AND PROFESSIONAL BIOLOGY. With Special Reference to Man. (A One- or Two-Year Course, including Introductory Embryology and Comparative Anatomy.) By Edward J. Menge, Ph.D., Director of the Department of Zoology, Marquette University, late Professor of Biology, University of Dallas. Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee, Wis. 1922. Pp. 959. Price, $6.50.

THE SCIENCE OF EDUCATION IN ITS SOCIOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL ASPECTS. By Otto Willmann, Ph.D. Authorized translation from the fourth German edition by Felix M. Kirsch, O.M.Cap. Vol. II. Archabbey Press, Beatty, Pa. 1922. Pp. xx—505.

PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN DEMOCRACY. By R. O. Hughes, Peabody High School, Pittsburgh. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta and San Francisco. 1922. Pp. xx—646. Price, $1.60.

ANALYSIS OF THE INTERCHURCH WORLD MOVEMENT REPORT ON THE STEEL STRIKE. By Marshall Olds. Foreword by Jeremiah W. Jenks, Ph.D., LL.D., Research Professor of Government and Public Administration, New York University. Edited as to the Law Involved in Labor Controversies by Murray T. Quigg, B.A., LL.B., Editor of *Law and Labor.* Edited as to Detailed Accuracy of Citations, Quotations, and Statistics by Haskins & Sells, Certified Public Accountants. Part II: History of the Interchurch Report on the Steel Strike. With the Assistance of Numerous Officials and Associates of the Interchurch World Movement. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York and London. 1922. Pp. xxiv—475.

THE RETURN OF CHRISTENDOM. By a Group of Churchmen. With an Introduction by Bishop Gore and an Epilogue by G. K. Chesterton. Macmillan Co., New York. 1922. Pp. xx—252. Price, $1.75.

SPIRITISM AND COMMON SENSE. By C. M. de Heredia, S.J. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1922. Pp. xvii—220. Price, $2.10 *postpaid.*

CHRIST VERSUS CAPITALISM. By the Rev. H. O'Laverty, B.A., Waratah, N.S.W., Australia. Pellegrini & Co., Sydney and Melbourne, Australia. 1922. Pp. 200.

DARWINISM AND CATHOLIC THOUGHT. By Canon Dorlodot, D.D., D.Sc., Director of the Theological Institute at Louvain University and Foreign Correspondent of the Geological Society of London. Translated by the Rev. Ernest Messenger, Professor of Logic and Cosmology at St. Edmund's College, Ware. Vol. I: The Origin of the Species. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1922. Pp. viii—184.

SHOP COLLECTIVE BARGAINING. A Study of Wage Determination in the Men's Garment Industry. By Francis J. Haas, Ph.D. (*Studies in the Social Sciences,* Vol. VII.) University Press, Kresge Bldg., Washington, D. C. 1922. Pp. vi—174.

LE POINT DE DÉPART DE LA MÉTAPHYSIQUE. Leçons sur le Développement Historique et Théoretique du Problème de la Connaissance. Par J. Maréchal, S.J., Docteur en Sciences, Professeur de Philosophie au Collège Philosophique

et Théologique de la Compagnie de Jésus à Louvain. Cahier I—De l'Antiquité à la fin du Moyen Age: La Critique Ancienne de la Connaissance. (*Museum Lessianum.* Publications dirigées par des Pères de la Compagnie de Jésus, Louvain.) Charles Beyaert, Bruges. 1922. Pp. xi—162. Prix, 12 *fr.* 50.

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF THE SUPERCONSCIOUS, or The Higher Phenomena of the Saints and Mystics viewed in the light of the Counter-Phenomena of the Psychics and Trance-Mediums and vindicating the Overwhelming Brilliancy of the Divine Light against its obscure and occult distortions. A Theory of Supraliminal Intuition overpowering the trance-control and showing the Transcendence of the Supernatural over the rival forms of Supernormal Cognition. A preliminary contribution in aid of a clearer understanding of this mysterious subject. By Philo Laos Mills, S.T.D., T.O.C.D., M.A.O.S., author of *Prehistoric Religion, Creation versus Evolution,* etc. Contraria contrariis curantur. National Capital Press, Washington, D. C. 1922. Pp. 81. Price, $1.00.

OPEN-MINDEDNESS. By the Rev. Joseph McSorley, C.S.P. Reprinted from *The Sacrament of Duty.* Paulist Press, New York City. Pp. 48.

SOME FALLACIES OF MODERN SOCIOLOGY. By the Rev. Albert Muntsch, S.J. (*Timely Topics Series,* No. 14.) Central Bureau of the Central Verein, 3835 Westminster Place, St. Louis. 1923. Pp. 19. Price, $0.10.

THE KU-KLUX-KLAN. By James M. Gillis, C.S.P. Paulist Press, 120 W. Sixtieth St., New York City. 1922. Pp. 14. Price, $0.05; $3.50 a hundred; $30.00 a thousand.

THE RELIGION OF THE PRIMITIVES. By the Most Rev. Alexander Le Roy, Superior General of the Fathers of the Holy Ghost. Translated by the Rev. Newton Thompson. Macmillan Co., New York. 1922. Pp. xi—334. Price, $2.50.

LITURGICAL.

BREVIARIUM NATALITIUM seu Officia Nativitatis et Epiphaniae Domini Nostri Jesu Christi earumque Octavarum necnon Festorum eo tempore occurentium ex Breviario Romano juxta Novissimas Variationes pro majori recitantium commoditate digestum. Pietro Marietti, Torino. 1923. Pp. 410. Pretium, *Lib. It.* 10.

CAEREMONIALE IN MISSA PRIVATA ET SOLEMNI Aliisque Frequentioribus Functionibus Liturgicis Servandum. Auctore C. Callewaert, J.C.D., Eccl. Cathedr. Brugensis Canonico Theologali, Seminarii Brugensis Praeside, ac S. Liturgiae Professore. Carolus Beyaert, Brugis. 1922. Pp. viii—347. Pretio pro exteris regionibus, 11 *fr.* 50.

THE SACRISTAN'S HANDBOOK. A Practical Guide for Sacristans. By Bernard Page, S.J., author of *A Practical Guide for Servers at Low Mass and Benediction, A Practical Guide for Servers at High Mass and the Services of Holy Week,* etc. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1922. Pp. 192. Price, $1.25 *net.*

LITANY OF THE SAINTS FOR THE FORTY HOURS' ADORATION. With Parts Harmonized for Two, Three, Four Voices, or All in Unison. By the Rev. Patrick Walsh, Louisville, Ky. Rogers Church Goods Co., 129 S. Fourth St., Louisville, Ky. 1922. Pp. 12. Price, $0.50.

HISTORICAL.

LA COMPAGNIE DE JÉSUS EN FRANCE. Histoire d'un Siècle. 1814-1914. Par Joseph Burnichon, S.J. Tome Quatrième: 1860-1880. Gabriel Beauchesne, Paris. 1922. Pp. 706. Prix, 24 *fr.*

ÉTUDES DE CRITIQUE ET D'HISTOIRE RELIGIEUSE. Par E. Vacandard, Aumônier du Lycée de Rouen. Quatrième Série: l'Apostolat de Saint Pierre a Rome; la papesse Jeanne; la prophétie de Saint Malachie; Sainte Geneviève de Paris; la fausse Jeanne d'Arc; les Origines du Salve Regina; l'auteur de l'Imitation de Jésus-Christ; l'Ame religieuse de Pierre Corneille. J. Gabalda, Paris. 1923. Pp. viii—268. Prix, 7 *fr.* 75 *franco.*

THE INFLUENCE OF THE CHURCH ON MODERN PROBLEMS. Papers by Various Writers Read at the Church Congress in 1922. Macmillan Co., New York. 1922. Pp. ix—223.

ALCUIN. By E. M. Wilmot-Buxton, F.R.Hist.S., author of *A Catholic History of Great Britain*, etc. (*Catholic Thought and Thinkers Series.* Edited by C. C. Martindale, S.J., M.A.) P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1922. Pp. 223. Price, $1.85 *postpaid.*

PRAELECTIONES HISTORIAE ECCLESIASTICAE. Ad Usum Scholarum. Dominicus Jaquet, O.M.C., Archiepiscopus Salaminius. 2 vol. Petrus Marietti, Taurini, Italia. 1922. Pp. xi—567 et 469. Pretium, 30 *Lib. It.*

A GENERAL HISTORY OF THE CHRISTIAN ERA. Vol. II: Modern Times Since 1517. A Textbook for High Schools and Colleges. By Nicholas A. Weber, S.M., S.T.D. With an Introduction by the Right Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D.D. Catholic Education Press, Washington, D. C. 1922. Pp. lvi—710.

REPORT OF PROCEEDINGS AND ADDRESSES, 19th Annual Meeting, Philadelphia, 26-29 June, 1922. Vol. XIX, No. 1, Catholic Educational Association, 1651 E. Main St., Columbus, Ohio. 1922. Pp. viii—564. Annual Individual Membership Fee, $2.00.

THE STORY OF EXTENSION. By the Right Rev. Francis C. Kelley, D.D., LL.D., Protonotary Apostolic, Honorary Canon of the Metropolitan Chapters of Mexico, Guadalajara and Morelia; Founder and President of the Catholic Church Extension Society of the United States of America. Extension Press, Wabash Ave., Chicago. 1922. Pp. 302.

THE MONASTIC CHRONICLER AND THE EARLY SCHOOL OF ST. ALBANS. A Lecture. By Claude Jenkins, Professor of Ecclesiastical History, King's College, London; Lambeth Librarian and Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London; Macmillan Co., New York and Toronto. 1922. Pp. 98.

WALTER DE GRAY, ARCHBISHOP OF YORK (1215-1255). By the Most Rev. H. Lowther Clarke, D.D., D.C.L., formerly Archbishop of Melbourne. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London; Macmillan Co., New York and Toronto. 1922. Pp. 32. Price, *sixpence.*

MISCELLANEOUS.

THE STORY OF WORLD PROGRESS. By Willis Mason West, sometime Professor of History and Head of the Department in the University of Minnesota. (*Allyn & Bacon's Series of School Histories.*) Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta and San Francisco. 1922. Pp. xix—716. Price, $2.00.

DICKENS' A TALE OF TWO CITIES. Edited with a Life of Dickens, Notes and other aids to the study of the book by A. B. de Mille, Secretary of the New England Association of Teachers of English. (*Academy Classics.*) Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta and San Francisco. 1922. Pp. viii—606. Price, $1.00.

LA FRANCE EN GUERRE. A French Reader for Elementary Classes. By M. de Genestoux. With Notes, Questionnaire and Vocabulary. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta and San Francisco. Pp. xiv—299. Price, $1.20.

FORTUNA—TONY. Por Enrique Pérez Escrich. Edited with Introduction, Notes, Exercises and Vocabulary by M. A. De Vitis. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta and San Francisco. 1922. Pp. xii—154. Price, $0.80.

EL INGENIOSO HIDALGO DON QUIJOTE DE LA MANCHA. By Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra. Edited with Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary by Daniel da Cruz, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of Romance Languages, and J. W. Kuhne, A.M., Associate Professor of Romance Languages, Miami University. Illustrations by Gustave Doré. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta and San Francisco. 1922. Pp. xv—66. Price, $1.20.

PECHEUR D'ISLANDE. Par Pierre Loti, de l'Académie Française. Edited with Introduction, Notes, Exercises and Vocabulary by Winfield S. Barney, Ph.D., Head of Department of Romance Languages, North Carolina College for Women. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta and San Francisco. 1922. Pp. xi—42. Price, $0.80.

UNE JOURNÉE CHEZ LES MOINES. Cinquième édition. P. Lethielleux ou Desclée, de Brouwer & Cie, Paris. 1922. Pp. viii—144. Prix, 8 *fr. franco.*

SELECTIONS FROM OVID. Chosen to Meet the New Requirements of the College Entrance Examination Board. By Francis W. Kelsey, University of Michigan, and Jared W. Scudder, Albany Academy. Allyn & Bacon, Boston, New York, Chicago, Atlanta and San Francisco. 1922. Pp. vi—66. Price, $1.00.

THE CATHOLIC DIARY FOR 1923. Edited by a Priest. (*The Angelus Series.* Fifteenth Year of Issue.) Burns, Oates & Washbourne, Ltd., London. Pp. 400. Price: cloth, 2/–; leather, 4/–.

SCOUTING FOR SECRET SERVICE. By Bernard F. J. Dooley. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1922. Pp. iv—259. Price, $1.35 *postpaid.*

LES FAISEURS DES RUINES. Roman. Par Mario Donal et M. T. Nessi. Maison de la Bonne Presse, Paris. Pp. 256. Prix, 2 *fr.* 30 *franco.*

MOTHER MACHREE. A Novel. By Martin J. Scott, S.J. Macmillan Co., New York. 1922. Pp. 177. Price, $1.75.

MUSA AMERICANA. Fifth Series: Shakespeare's Julius Caesar. In Latin Accentual Iambic Verse with English Text. By Anthony F. Geyser, S.J., A.M., Professor of Latin Literature, Campion College, Prairie du Chien, Wis. Loyola University Press, Chicago. 1922. Pp. 167. Price, $0.60.

VERSES FOR VARIOUS OCCASIONS. By Mary Christina Austin, Editor of *North American Teacher.* Illustrated by Harriet O'Brien. North American Teacher Publishing Co., Boston. 1922. Pp. 79.

LA REVERDIE. Roman. Par Jean Mauclère. Maison de la Bonne Presse, Paris. 1922. Pp. 94. Prix, 0 *fr.* 90 *franco.*

GOING HOME. By Eliza Martin. H. L. Kilner & Co., Philadelphia. Pp. 436. Price, $1.10 *postpaid.*

TO THE DARK TOWER. Being Gerard Linton's Account of All that Happened at the House of Jacques Cournot in the Summer of 1907. By Mark S. Gross, S.J. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York. 1922. Pp. 356. Price, $1.90 *postpaid.*

NO HANDICAP. A Novel. By Marion Ames Taggart. Benziger Brothers, New York, Cincinnati, Chicago. 1922. Pp. 348. Price, $2.15 *postpaid.*

CORA MILLER. Roman. Par Jacques Marney. Maison de la Bonne Presse, Paris. Pp. 285. Prix, 2 *fr.* 30 *franco.*

SARANAC. A Story of Lake Champlain. By John Talbot Smith. New edition. Blase Benziger & Co., New York. 1922. Pp. 280. Price, $1.90 *postpaid.*

THE ADVENTURERS. By Maurice Francis Egan, former American Minister to Denmark. H. L. Kilner & Co., Philadelphia. 1922. Pp. 224. Price, $1.25 *net.*

MARISE. Roman. Par Jean Mauclère. Maison de la Bonne Presse, Paris. Pp. 222. Prix, 2 *fr.* 30 *franco.*

RAFTERY'S POEMS. Songs of Life, Love, and Liberty. Raftery Publishing Co., 376 W. Monroe St., Chicago. 1922. Pp. 160. Price, $0.75 *postpaid.*

MARY'S RAINBOW. By Clementia, author of *Mostly Mary, Uncle Frank's Mary, The Quest of Mary Selwyn, Bird-a-Lea,* etc. Matre & Co., Chicago. 1922. Pp. 157. Price, $1.00 *postpaid.*